

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate October 18 (legislative day of October 12), 1943:

APPOINTMENTS, BY TRANSFER, IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

TO ORDNANCE DEPARTMENT

Capt. Horace Freeman Bigelow, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 10, 1942.

TO INFANTRY

Lt. Col. George Allan Miller, Adjutant General's Department (temporary colonel), with rank from August 18, 1940.

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

To be colonels with rank from October 1, 1943

Lt. Col. Omar Nelson Bradley, Infantry (temporary lieutenant general).

Lt. Col. Paul John Mueller, Infantry (temporary major general).

Lt. Col. Leland Stanford Hobbs, Infantry (temporary major general).

Lt. Col. John Frederick Kahle, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. Edwin Bowman Lyon, Air Corps (temporary brigadier general).

Lt. Col. Reinhold Melberg, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. Clarence Brewster Lindner, Finance Department (temporary colonel), subject to examination required by law.

IN THE NAVY

Capt. Leo H. Thebaud, United States Navy, to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 21st day of June 1942.

Capt. Bertram J. Rodgers, United States Navy, to be a commodore in the Navy, for temporary service, while serving on the staff of the supreme allied commander, southeast Asia, to rank from the 14th day of October 1943.

Capt. Stanley D. Jupp, United States Navy, to be a commodore in the Navy, for temporary service, while serving as commandant, naval operating base, Auckland, New Zealand, to rank from the 13th day of October 1943.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following-named naval aviators of the Marine Corps Reserve to be second lieutenants in the Regular Marine Corps in accordance with the provisions of the Naval Aviation Personnel Act of 1940, as amended, to rank from the dates stated:

Harold B. Penne, from the 12th day of May 1941

Arthur K. Bourret, from the 18th day of August 1941.

Harold E. Allen, from the 30th day of August 1941.

Harry D. Pratt, a citizen of California, to be a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 1st day of December 1942.

First Sgt. Arthur F. Wilson, Jr., a meritorious noncommissioned officer to be a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 21st day of April 1943.

The below-named citizens to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps from the 4th day of May 1943:

Warren B. Capron, a citizen of Kansas.

Luther A. Bookout, a citizen of Texas.

Theodore D. Vreeland, a citizen of New Jersey.

Platoon Sgt. Raymond S. McFall, a meritorious noncommissioned officer to be a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 5th day of May 1943.

Edward D. Miller, Jr., a citizen of Texas, to be a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 5th day of May 1943.

LXXXIX—531

The below-named citizens to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps from the 16th day of June 1943:

Edward H. Stauffer, a citizen of Iowa.

Robert K. West, a citizen of Montana.

Jack P. Stone, a citizen of Texas.

The below-named citizens to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps from the 30th day of June 1943:

Guy B. Mayo, a citizen of Pennsylvania.

Harry Feehan, a citizen of New York.

Richard Q. Lewis, a citizen of Oregon, to be a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 14th day of July 1943.

Platoon Sgt. Cleveland C. Barry, a meritorious noncommissioned officer to be a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 28th day of July 1943.

The below-named citizens to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps from the 28th day of July 1943:

William E. Collier, a citizen of Louisiana.

Richard B. Smith, a citizen of Maryland.

George E. Lawrence, a citizen of North Carolina.

The below-named citizens to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps from the 7th day of August 1943:

Ralph E. Knight, Jr., a citizen of Mississippi.

William A. Barry, a citizen of Ohio.

Arthur E. Isensee, a citizen of California.

The below-named meritorious noncommissioned officers to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps from the 25th day of August 1943:

Platoon Sgt. John R. Glibney.

Platoon Sgt. Charles H. Booth.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate October 18 (legislative day of October 12), 1943:

SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM

Angus J. Gallagher, to be administrative officer, at \$5,600 per annum, national headquarters, Selective Service System.

POSTMASTERS

IOWA

Gertrude Hunter, Floyd.

Lillian V. White, Manilla.

Wilbur G. Flam, New London.

Ella L. Klopping, Underwood.

MASSACHUSETTS

James F. Brennan, North Attleboro.

Edward C. Harney, Pepperell.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, OCTOBER 18, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Again, Almighty God, we take Thy holy name upon our lips and pray that it may never be in vain. We praise Thee that Thou art the God of the Beatitudes, infinite in wisdom and truth; on errands of deliverance do Thou be abroad in this dark-hued earth. In this most crucial period of its history, we pray that we may be most wise by precept and example to direct the nations out of the contending forces of evil, causing to be born a bond of international fellowship. If need be, dear Lord, level every throne with the spirit of humility; feed them

with Thy strength and endow them with the power of Thy truth, then shall the masters of ambition and the autocracy of hate be no more.

Thou Saviour and Friend of man, we rejoice that the centuries have revealed no discord in Thy Word and no flaw in Thy beauty. O Master, from whom earth's greatest souls have borrowed their gifts, inspire us to love and to cherish Thy Holy Bible. We pray that the genius of its teaching may become the inspiration of our civilization; herein Dives is set face to face with Lazarus and they struggle not to escape the burden, but for the right of bearing it. O Book divine, which giveth wells of comfort for thirsty souls, vineyards for hungry wayfarers, light for those in darkness, and immortal life to those in death, fill our hearts today with new hope and peace, and Thine shall be the praise forevermore. In Jesus' name we pray. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, October 14, 1943, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 3029. An act to authorize the adoption of a report relating to seepage and drainage damages on the Illinois River, Ill.

The message also announced that the Senate had adopted the following resolution (S. Res. 194):

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. Edward W. Creal, late a Representative from the State of Kentucky.

Resolved, That a committee of two Senators be appointed by the President of the Senate to join the committee appointed on the part of the House of Representatives to attend the funeral of the deceased Representative.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased the Senate do now take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The message also announced that pursuant to the provisions of the above resolution the Presiding Officer had appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. CHANDLER members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

SALES TAX

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, we are hearing a great deal in reference to the 10-percent Federal sales tax in connection with the pending revenue bill. Such a tax, Mr. Speaker, would lower the

standard of living of over 100,000,000 people, and it would cost the people of the State of Missouri, part of which I have the honor to represent, \$170,000,000 annually. I base this statement on the fact that the official in charge of collections of the Missouri sales tax announces that for the calendar year about \$34,000,000 will be collected. For the past 10 years we have had a 2-percent sales tax in Missouri. On the basis of \$34,000,000 being collected under a 2-percent sales tax, if the Federal Government should add a 10-percent sales tax that, of course, would mean \$170,000,000 for the Federal Government, or a total of \$204,000,000, including the \$34,000,000 collected by the State.

The burden of this falls on the great majority who live and spend the weekly earnings for the necessities of life. Take an income in the family of \$200 a month after present deductions. Sales tax, 2 percent for the State and 10 percent for the Federal Government, would take \$24 monthly from the table and for other necessities. It would be no burden for those whose income exceeds the amount they have been used to spending.

Mr. Speaker, over 100,000,000 people in the country have lived from pay day to pay day. They have no surplus. Their standard of living would be lowered if such a tax were levied. Ability to pay would be lost sight of and "soak the rich" would be changed to "take care of the rich," the soaking would affect the masses of the people. As you walk along the streets of a large city you pass one employer to several hundred employees and it is the latter upon whom this tax would really fall. There are still many ways we can raise revenue without resorting to the sales tax.

I want to express the hope that when the revenue bill is brought in it will not contain a provision for a Federal sales tax.

NEW YORK CITY POLICE AND FIRE DEPARTMENTS

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

[Mr. O'TOOLE addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and include therein an article that appeared in the Boston Sunday Globe of yesterday, by Charles A. Merrill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

[Mr. GOSSETT, Mr. HARNES of Indiana, and Mr. DOMENGAUX asked and were given permission to extend their own remarks in the Record.]

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that tomorrow, at

the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and include therein a radio speech I made on the Mutual network.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and include therein a resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, last week the House gave me permission to insert certain extraneous remarks in the Record. The Public Printer has advised that this will cover 2½ pages of the Record and cost \$112. In view of the fact that it is a discussion of the question of food, a matter of vital importance, by a person well informed on the subject, I feel that it should be in the Record, and I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed notwithstanding the fact that it exceeds the limit.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record in two respects, in one to include a resolution from the Social Hygiene Society of Washington regarding Dr. Ruhland, and in the other to include an excerpt from the Iron Age of October 7.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and include therein an address I recently made, and further to extend my own remarks and include therein an editorial from the Columbia State.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and include therein excerpts from editorials.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

[Mr. COFFEE addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

STATE OF ARIZONA

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, the State of Arizona has done her full share and has done unusually well in many respects in time of war, both in former wars and in the present struggle, not only on the battle fronts, but on the home front, in production, in finance, and in every other way contributing to the war effort.

I hold in my hand a tabulation showing the result of the Third War loan drive just completed. The employees of the Treasury Department in the Internal Revenue service at Phoenix, Ariz., have gone far over the top in buying bonds. Of the 64 districts throughout the country, the employees of that Arizona district head the list. According to this tabulation, the employees of Internal Revenue service in Arizona have purchased bonds in this recent War loan drive—in addition to their regular purchases—more than 512 percent of their suggested quota. They take pride in this record of "Backing the Attack" and I take pleasure in announcing it.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix and insert an editorial from the Scranton Times, a paper published in Scranton, Pa., about our distinguished colleague, Congressman McGRANERY.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and include an article from the Washington Post on Haiti.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after the legislative business of today and the other special orders, I be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after all other special orders and the legislative business is concluded I be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and include an editorial from DeWitt Emory, the national president of

the National Association of Small Business Men.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?
There was no objection.

WHAT THE SEVENTEENTH DISTRICT OF OHIO WANTS OF CONGRESS

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?
There was no objection.

[Mr. MCGREGOR addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an editorial from the Ohio Farmer.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?
There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include in the Appendix excerpts from the War Food Administration.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?
There was no objection.

FERTILIZER

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?
There was no objection.

[Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record and include a statement by Governor Sharp, in respect to rubber.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?
There was no objection.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after the other special orders today I be permitted to address the House for 5 minutes and include an address.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?
There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record on grade labeling.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?
There was no objection.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that tomorrow, after the legislative business and any other special orders I be permitted to address the House for 25 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?
There was no objection.

REDUCTION OF GOVERNMENTAL EXPENDITURES

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?
There was no objection.

[Mr. VOORHIS of California addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the calendar on Wednesday be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?
There was no objection.

OFF-THE-RECORD MEETING OF HOUSE MEMBERS

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?
There was no objection.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I do this for the information of my colleagues, because this morning they received a letter from the Speaker in respect to a meeting to be held Wednesday morning, and in that letter it was stated that the meeting would be held in the Caucus Room of the old House Office Building, at which meeting General Marshall and other generals would appear in an off-the-record manner. The old Caucus Room has been looked over, as well as the auditorium of the Library of Congress. It is felt that the auditorium of the Library of Congress is a much more desirable place to hold the meeting, and I rise to announce that, instead of holding the meeting in the old Caucus Room, it will be held in the auditorium of the Library of Congress.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCCORMACK. Yes.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, if I remember correctly, the statement of the gentleman is that this would be an executive session?

Mr. MCCORMACK. Yes.

Mr. RANKIN. Now, if we are going to hold executive sessions of the House, there is only one place that we are authorized by law to hold them, and that is in this Hall.

Mr. MCCORMACK. This is not an executive session of Congress.

Mr. RANKIN. It is going to be a secret session, and it ought to be, and it ought to be held in the Hall of the House of Representatives.

Mr. MCCORMACK. This is not an executive session of Congress.

Mr. RANKIN. It is unnecessary for the Congress of the United States to be going off to some other building to hear these leaders report on the war when we have the Hall of the House of Representatives built and equipped for that purpose.

Will not the gentleman modify his request to have that meeting here in this Hall?

The SPEAKER. The Chair would not recognize the gentleman for that purpose and the gentleman would not make such a request.

The time of the gentleman has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include therein two poems.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?
There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix and include an article from the Washington News.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?
There was no objection.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include certain material from yesterday's paper.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?
There was no objection.

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the Appendix a radio address by Mr. Cornwell Jackson before the Writers' Club.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?
There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday next at the conclusion of other special orders and the regular business of the day I may be permitted to address the House for 35 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?
There was no objection.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Friday of this week after the regular order of business my colleague from Missouri [Mr. MILLER] may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?
There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 20 minutes today after the other special orders.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?
There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOLMES of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to place in the Record a letter from Gov. Arthur B. Langlie, and also one from William F. Devin, mayor of the city of Seattle, concerning the construction of a highway from Prince George, B. C., to Watson Lake, on the Alcan Highway.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?
There was no objection.

Mr. ARNOLD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record and to include two very interesting extracts from the Journal of the American Osteopathic Association.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?
There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record on two subjects and include therein brief statements and excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?
There was no objection.

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix and include several newspaper clippings and editorials.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?
There was no objection.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record and include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?
There was no objection.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an editorial from the Gary (Ind.) Tribune.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a resolution adopted by the Women's Democratic Clubs of Kentucky.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that following the termination of today's business and the disposition of other special orders I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, after disposition of the business on the Speaker's desk and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, at the conclusion of the legislative program and following any other special orders heretofore entered, I may address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after the expiration of the legislative business and any other special orders, I may be permitted to address the House today for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

SALES TAX

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, no one is more opposed to the sales tax than am I. Unfortunately, the Government must have more money. Where can we get it? The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN], sitting to my right, probably expressed the opposition of those who are going to vote against a sales tax, but the gentleman and his colleagues during the last 10 years have been supporting an administration which has been spending and wasting money by the billions, and

now we have to pay for that spending. The administration has been spending without thought of where the money can be found. The day of reckoning is now with us. More unfortunately, the administration has been drying up the sources of taxation that were available before by assaults on business, so where, other than by a sales tax, are we going to get the money after milking other sources dry?

We have been trying to make some savings to reduce the amount needed by investigations of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, but the gentleman from Missouri does not want any investigation by that committee of those who have been wasting this money. Oh, no; he wants to spend the money, but he does not want a sales tax to get the money which the New Deal proposes to spend. If we could only save a little, it probably would not be necessary, if we have to pass a sales tax, to make it for more than 5 percent. Why yell all the time for new and additional spending and then oppose the levying of taxes to raise the funds for that spending?

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. RANKIN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

DOUBLE-HEADER DEPARTMENT

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, some years ago we had the rather interesting spectacle of double-header Thanksgivings that were brought about by Executive order. Now we have a double-header Department of Agriculture.

On October 1, the Department issued a release commenting on the Executive order effected on March 26, and amended on April 19, and here is a statement from the release itself:

The amendment to Executive order so defined the respective duties and functions of the Secretary of Agriculture and the War Food Administrator, that each has authority to exercise any and all powers vested in the other by statute or otherwise.

There are some interesting possibilities in having a Secretary of Agriculture who can exercise all the functions of the War Food Administrator and a War Food Administrator who can exercise all the functions of the Secretary of Agriculture.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(Mr. CELLER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks in the RECORD.)

THE CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Consent Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the calendar.

WARTIME CONSTRUCTION AND OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE OF RECLAMATION PROJECTS

The Clerk called the first bill on the calendar, H. R. 3018, authorizing wartime construction and operation and maintenance of reclamation projects.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COLE of New York, Mr. KEAN, and Mr. CUNNINGHAM objected, and the bill was stricken from the calendar.

The SPEAKER. The calling of the Consent Calendar will be suspended for the moment.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. DISNEY].

ELECTION TO COMMITTEE

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following resolution by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means, and move its adoption.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That JOHN LESINSKI, of Michigan, and EDWARD J. HART, of New Jersey, be, and they are hereby, elected members of the Standing Committee of the House of Representatives on the Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

The resolution was agreed to.

THE CONSENT CALENDAR

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2697, to provide for the disposal of materials or resources on the public lands of the United States which are under the exclusive jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, objection was made to this bill on the last call of the calendar on the ground that the authority conveyed by the bill was too broad and unrestricted. We have since discussed the bill with the author, and the chairman of the Committee on the Public Lands, we are advised, has prepared an amendment which will impose limitations upon the exercise of this authority. With the understanding that this amendment will be offered, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may we not have an explanation of what these restrictions will be?

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I have at the Clerk's desk an amendment in conformity with the discussion already had with the gentleman from New York. The power authorized was for the disposal of sand, gravel, and timber, particularly. In the amendment we are limiting the power to the period of the war; second, we are requiring that before disposition is made they shall advertise for 30 days in a newspaper in the community in which the property is situated, or if there is no newspaper in that county, then in a newspaper in the adjoining county; third, we do not authorize anything that is already prohibited by law; and, fourth, we limit the amount involved to \$10,000.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, with the understanding that the limitation of \$10,000 will be written into the bill as the

amount of natural resources that can be disposed of at one time, and that the power granted shall cease to exist at the cessation of hostilities, under the amendment that is proposed, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior, under such rules as he may prescribe, may dispose of materials or resources, including sand, stone, gravel, vegetation, and timber or other forest products, on public lands of the United States which are under his exclusive jurisdiction, if the disposal of such materials or resources is not otherwise expressly authorized by law and if such disposal would not be detrimental to the public interest. Such materials or resources may be disposed of only upon the payment of adequate compensation therefor, to be determined by the Secretary, and only after public notice of the disposal has been given prior thereto in such manner as may be prescribed by the Secretary. Nothing in this section shall be construed to apply to any national park or national monument or to any Indian lands or lands set aside or held for the use or benefit of Indians, including lands over which jurisdiction has been transferred to the Department of the Interior by Executive order for the use of Indians.

SEC. 2. All moneys received from the disposal of materials or resources under this act shall be disposed of in the same manner as moneys received from the sale of public lands.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 2 add a new section, as follows: "SEC. 3. Before disposing of any such materials or resources referred to in section 1, the Secretary shall first give public notice, published in a newspaper published in the county where such materials are located, and if no newspaper is published in such county, then in the county nearest thereto, for at least 30 days, of his intention to dispose of such materials or resources. No such materials or resources in excess of \$10,000 shall be disposed of unless authorized by valid laws of the United States. The powers granted in this act shall cease to exist at the cessation of hostilities in the present war, as determined by the President by proclamation or the Congress by concurrent resolution, and the provisions of this act shall not apply where disposal of such materials or resources have been expressly prohibited by valid laws of the United States."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PETERSON].

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

APPROPRIATION FOR SALARIES AND EXPENSES, OFFICE OF FISHERY COORDINATION

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 1242, to authorize appropriations for salaries and expenses, Office of Fishery Coordination.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLAND]?

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF AN ADDITIONAL ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2801, to provide for the appointment of an additional Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST]?

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF A NATIONAL AGRICULTURAL JEFFERSON BICENTENARY COMMITTEE

The Clerk called the next bill, Senate Joint Resolution 47, providing for the appointment of a National Agricultural Jefferson Bicentenary Committee to carry out under the general direction of the United States Commission for the Celebration of the Two Hundredth Anniversary of the Birth of Thomas Jefferson, appropriate exercises and activities in recognition of the services and contributions of Thomas Jefferson to the farmers and the agriculture of the Nation.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice and I ask unanimous consent to extend and revise my remarks in the RECORD with certain enclosures.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLAND]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLAND. When this bill was called on October 4, 1943, it was objected to for the reason that it provided for the celebration therein held to be conducted under the auspices of the United States Commission for the Celebration of the Two Hundredth Anniversary of the Birth of Thomas Jefferson, and it was suggested that it was not good parliamentary procedure to include in a resolution so many whereas clauses. I was present when the resolution was reported and I concur in the objection that there were too many whereas clauses, but raised no objection at the time the bill was reported.

I have drawn two amendments to the bill. First, to strike out all after the enacting clause and inserting the new resolution which eliminates many of the whereas clauses. I have also eliminated from the bill, all reference to the United States Commission for the Celebration of the Two Hundredth Anniversary of the Birth of Thomas Jefferson. These corrections, in my opinion, remove all objections urged to the bill. A further amendment has been to amend the title so as to conform to the resolution. The amendment to the title removes all reference to the United States Commission for the Celebration of the Two Hundredth Anniversary of the Birth of Thomas Jefferson.

Since the bill was called on the last calendar day, I have received two letters—one from the Secretary of Agriculture, the Honorable Claude R. Wickard, the pertinent portions of which are as follows:

The Department of Agriculture, the Land-Grant Colleges, and many of the agricultural, scientific, and educational institutions throughout the country are greatly interested in this proposal and in having some congressional basis for the promotion of Nation-wide programs and activities appropriate to honoring Jefferson for his services to American agriculture. I have advised with the representatives of a number of organizations that are interested in this proposal, and they, together with the Department of Agriculture, are agreeable to the modification of the language of the resolution whereby the whereas clauses and reference to the Bicentenary Commission will be eliminated.

I hope that appropriate action can be taken by the chairman of the Library Committee or you when the matter next comes up for consideration. We have endeavored to get in touch with Senator BYRN, who introduced the resolution in the Senate and who has taken great personal interest in the matter. Unfortunately, we have been unable to reach Senator BYRN, but we trust that he will understand the circumstances and that he will be agreeable to taking appropriate action in the Senate following the action by the House.

The general plans which have been made in connection with this matter have called for appropriate programs and exercises to be in the rural schools, in farm meetings, and in scientific meetings of agriculture which are largely held this coming winter. Preliminary programs have been made for carrying out the activity and the delay in connection with the program has not seriously interfered. However, speedy action in connection with the resolution is now necessary.

May I express to you and to the other members of the Library Committee our appreciation for your personal interest in the matter and for the action which you took in connection with it on the floor of the House on October 4.

I also received the following letter from the assistant to the president of the National Farmers' Union, Mr. Paul Sifton:

For the National Farmers Union, may I respectfully urge favorable consideration and action on S. J. Res. 47, relating to the observances of the Jefferson Bicentennial, providing for an agricultural committee to emphasize the great Jefferson's contributions to the development of American agriculture.

I believe that the above amendments meet all objections to the bill.

I have not been able to see the members of the Library Committee or other Members on the floor, but I am inserting these remarks in the RECORD with the hope that persons previously objecting may let me know this week that if there are any objections to the bill, and also that I may be notified so as to try to get the bill in satisfactory form at once, as I contemplate asking the Speaker, majority leader, and minority leader, for permission to call up this bill at any opportune time in the next few days.

I have also been advised over the telephone by other persons interested in the bill but not Members of Congress that they would be glad if I would bring the bill up at the earliest opportunity.

One amendment amends the text of the bill and the other amendment amends the title. The two amendments meet the previous objections made to the bill.

Amendments by Mr. BLAND: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "The purpose of this resolution is to authorize in this year 1943, which marks the two hundredth anniversary of the birth of Thomas Jefferson, the creation of the National Agricultural Jefferson Bicentenary Committee which, together with public and private institutions in the service of agriculture, the United States Department of Agriculture and the State colleges of agriculture and organizations composed of farmers and their families, is hereby authorized to hold, conduct, and participate in ceremonies and activities throughout the Nation not only to revere Thomas Jefferson as a patriotic statesman and philosopher, as author of the Declaration of Independence, as a private citizen and President of the United States but also in recognition of our great debt to him as a farmer, agricultural philosopher, inventive genius, educator, and leader in scientific agriculture: Therefore be it

Resolved, That there be created the National Agricultural Jefferson Bicentenary Committee. The Secretary of Agriculture is hereby appointed chairman of and is hereby authorized to organize such committee. The President pro tempore of the Senate shall appoint as members of the committee five Members of the Senate. The Speaker of the House of Representatives shall appoint as members of the Committee five Members of the House of Representatives. The Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized to appoint in his discretion an appropriate number of members of the committee representing the following agricultural organizations:

"United States Department of Agriculture.

"The land-grant colleges (including the colleges of agriculture, the agricultural experiment stations, and the agricultural extension services).

"National farm organizations.

"The agricultural press.

"Scientific and learned societies dealing with agriculture.

"The Office of Education.

"The Secretary of Agriculture is empowered to appoint a secretary for the committee. All members of the committee are to serve without compensation. The duties of the committee shall be to assist in bringing to the attention of the people of the United States the great services rendered by Jefferson to agriculture and to encourage and promote appropriate and timely activities in connection with the various agricultural organizations mentioned above and of the States of the United States, in the various agricultural meetings to be held during the current year, to encourage appropriate programs dealing with Jefferson and agriculture in the United States Department of Agriculture and the land-grant colleges, to encourage widespread dissemination through the press, the radio, farmers' meetings, the rural schools and agricultural high schools, and so forth, information about Jefferson.

"Sec. 2. The provisions of this joint resolution shall not be construed to authorize the making of any appropriation to carry out its purpose."

Amend the title to read as follows: "Joint resolution to provide for the appointment of a National Agricultural Jefferson Bicentenary Committee to carry out appropriate exercises and activities in recognition of the services and contributions of Thomas Jefferson to the farmers and the agriculture of the Nation."

FUR SEAL AGREEMENT OF 1942 BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND CANADA

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2924, to give effect to the Provisional Fur Seal Agreement of 1942 between the United States of America and Canada; to protect the fur seals of the Pribilof Islands; and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. DIMOND] is here. I wish he would give us an explanation of this bill.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, as the individual reporting the bill, I may say that the purpose of the bill is to carry into effect an agreement made between the State Department and Canada for the protection of the fur seal industry. The existing fur seal treaty or I should say the fur seal treaty that has existed for many years and that has served as a great protection to the furs of the world has been abrogated by Japan. The result of the abrogation would permit not only the people of our own Nation but others to fish in the waters affected without restrictions that are necessary for our protection.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Will the gentleman explain what he means by "emergency" in this bill? Is that for the duration?

Mr. BLAND. It was deemed wise that this agreement, which was worked out between Canada and the United States, should be given effect. As the situation now stands the breach of the fur seal agreement of 1911, I think it is, leaves not only Canada without restrictions but leaves our own citizens without restrictions for the protection of the fur seal industry. There is no question but what the Secretary of State is in favor of this bill, the Canadian authorities desire to put it into effect, the Department of the Interior demands this legislation, and it is essential to protect the fur seal industry of the United States.

Mr. KEAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLAND. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. KEAN. I notice that the agreement will remain in effect for the duration of the present emergency and 12 months thereafter. Exactly what is the present emergency and 12 months thereafter?

Mr. BLAND. The present emergency is the war and the 12 months thereafter I would regard following the termination of the war. If there should be no protection for this agreement, unless protected in this way, there might be a breach of it by our own citizens and by others. I may say to the gentleman that the amendment referred to is an amendment offered by the gentleman from California.

Mr. WELCH. Should this country or Canada withdraw from this agreement the part of bill which is designed to implement that agreement would cease to be effective.

Mr. KEAN. I refer to the question of putting legislation in for the duration of

the emergency. Does the gentleman from Virginia expect that after the war is over the President will say not only that the war is over but will also issue a proclamation saying that the emergency is over?

Mr. BLAND. No. I think that the fur-seal problem in Alaska as well as the fisheries problem generally are going to be two of the most essential, valuable, and most important post-war problems we will have and we desire to have no situation whereby we would terminate this protection either as to the United States or as to Canada.

Mr. KEAN. Is the gentleman satisfied with the wording "for the duration of the present emergency and 12 months thereafter"?

Mr. BLAND. Yes; because the United States might not be bound except with this language, and action taken in Canada might fail to reach fishing on our side so that we would not have the protection that is accorded by this bill. The danger is in part a danger from our own people.

Mr. KEAN. The gentleman is such a profound student of these matters that if he is satisfied I am, but I just wanted to call his attention to it.

Mr. BLAND. That amendment made necessary an adjournment of our committee to consider the necessary language for the amendment.

Mr. HINSHAW. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLAND. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. I understand there are several emergencies effected by proclamations of the President that have not yet been terminated, emergencies that were declared in times gone by. It seems to me that the term "present emergency" as used in this bill is very indefinite. It does not say which of the several emergencies that have been declared.

Mr. BLAND. There is no protection now or at least not sufficient protection now and what we have provided or tried to provide constitutes more or less something of a stopgap, but thank God it is a stopgap.

Mr. HINSHAW. I recognize the desire of having this bill passed, but does not the gentleman think he ought to better define the term "emergency" in the bill?

Mr. BLAND. I think we had better watch the situation and if we find it is necessary, bring in additional legislation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That when used in this act—

(a) "Pelagic sealing" means the killing, capturing, or pursuing, or the attempted killing, capturing, or pursuing of fur seals at sea, whether within or without the territorial waters of the United States.

(b) "Sealing" means the killing, capturing, or pursuing, or the attempted killing, capturing, or pursuing, of fur seals in or on any lands or waters subject to the jurisdiction of the United States.

(c) "Sea-otter hunting" means the killing, capturing, or pursuing, or the attempted killing, capturing, or pursuing, of sea otters at sea, except in waters subject to the jurisdiction of the United States where other laws are applicable.

(d) "Person" includes individual, association, partnership, and corporation.

(e) "Secretary" means the Secretary of the Interior.

(f) "Fur-seal agreement" means the provisional fur-seal agreement between the United States and Canada effected by an exchange of notes signed at Washington, D. C., on December 8, 1942, and on December 19, 1942, and any other treaty or agreement hereafter entered into by the United States for the protection of fur seals.

(g) "North Pacific Ocean" includes the Bering Sea.

(h) "Import" means land on or bring into, or attempt to land on or bring into, any place subject to the jurisdiction of the United States.

SEC. 2. It shall be unlawful, except as hereinafter provided, for any citizen or national of the United States, or person owing duty of obedience to the laws or treaties of the United States, or any vessel of the United States, or person belonging to or on such vessel, to engage in pelagic sealing or sea-otter hunting in or on the waters of the North Pacific Ocean; or for any person or vessel to engage in sealing; or for any person or vessel to use any port or harbor or other place subject to the jurisdiction of the United States for any purpose connected in any way with the operation of pelagic sealing, sea-otter hunting, or sealing; or for any person to transport, import, offer for sale, or have in possession at any port, place, or on any vessel subject to the jurisdiction of the United States, raw, dressed, or dyed skins of sea otters taken contrary to the provisions of this section or, where taken pursuant to section 3 of this act, not officially marked and certified as having been so taken, or raw, dressed, or dyed skins of fur seals taken in or on the waters of the North Pacific Ocean or on lands subject to the jurisdiction of the United States, except seal skins which have been taken under the authority of this act or under the authority of the respective parties to any fur-seal agreement and which have been officially marked and certified as having been so taken.

SEC. 3. Indians, Aleuts, or other aborigines dwelling on the American coasts of the waters of the North Pacific Ocean shall be permitted to carry on pelagic sealing or sea-otter hunting without the use of firearms from canoes or undecked boats, propelled wholly by paddles, oars, or sails, and not transported by or used in connection with other vessels, and manned by not more than five persons each, in the way heretofore practiced by said Indians, Aleuts, or other aborigines, and shall be permitted to dispose of the skins of fur seals or sea otters so taken as they see fit, but only after such skins have been officially marked and certified as provided in section 2 of this act. The exception made in this section shall not apply to Indians, Aleuts, or other aborigines in the employment of other persons or who shall engage in pelagic sealing or sea-otter hunting under contract to deliver the skins to any person.

SEC. 4. In order to continue the proper utilization of the fur-seal herd of the North Pacific Ocean and to carry out the purposes of this act, the Secretary is authorized to permit sealing on the Pribilof and other islands and on the shores of waters subject to the jurisdiction of the United States, by officers and employees of the Fish and Wildlife Service designated by him and by the natives of the Territory of Alaska, and to adopt suitable regulations governing the same whenever he shall determine that such sealing is

necessary or desirable and not inconsistent with preservation of the seals of the Pacific Ocean. The Secretary is also authorized to permit pelagic sealing in the event of emergency circumstances by officers and employees of the Fish and Wildlife Service and by the natives of the Territory of Alaska under such conditions and for such periods as may be agreed upon by consultation between the Government of the United States and the Government of Canada in accordance with the provisions of article II of the Provisional Fur Seal Agreement of 1942.

SEC. 5. Subject to the provisions of sections 3 and 15 of this act, all seal or sea-otter skins taken under the authority conferred by this act, or forfeited to the United States, and all seal skins delivered to the United States pursuant to the terms of any fur-seal agreement shall be sold under the direction of the Secretary in such market, at such times, and in such manner as he may deem most advantageous; and the proceeds of such sale shall be paid into the Treasury of the United States.

SEC. 6. The Pribilof Islands, including the islands of St. Paul and St. George, Walrus and Otter Islands, and Sea Lion Rock, in Alaska, are declared a special reservation for Government purposes. It shall be unlawful for any person to land or remain on any of those islands, except through stress of weather or like unavoidable cause or by the authority of the Secretary, and any person found on any of those islands contrary to the provisions of this section shall be summarily removed and shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, punishable by a fine not exceeding \$500 or by imprisonment not exceeding 6 months, or by both fine and imprisonment.

SEC. 7. Whenever seals are killed and seal skins taken on any of the Pribilof Islands the native inhabitants of the islands shall be employed in such killing and in curing the skins taken, and shall receive for their labor fair compensation to be fixed from time to time by the Secretary, who shall have the authority to prescribe the manner in which such compensation shall be paid to the natives or expended or otherwise used on their behalf and for their benefit.

SEC. 8. The Secretary shall have authority to establish and maintain depots for provisions and supplies on the Pribilof Islands and to provide for the transportation of such provisions and supplies from the mainland of the United States to the islands by the charter of private vessels or by the use of public vessels of the United States which may be under his control or which may be placed at his disposal by the President; and he likewise shall have authority to furnish food, shelter, fuel, clothing, and other necessities of life to the native inhabitants of the Pribilof Islands and to provide for their comfort, maintenance, education, and protection.

SEC. 9. Under the direction of the Secretary, the Fish and Wildlife Service is authorized to investigate the conditions of seal life upon the rookeries of the Pribilof Islands, and to continue the inquiries relative to the life history and migrations of the seals frequenting the waters of the North Pacific Ocean.

SEC. 10. Any officer or employee of the Department of the Interior authorized by the Secretary, any naval or other officer designated by the President, any marshal or deputy marshal, any collector or deputy collector of customs, and any other person authorized by law to enforce the provisions of this act shall have power, without warrant, to arrest any person committing a violation of this act or any regulation made pursuant thereto in his presence or view, and to take such person immediately for examination or trial before an officer or court of competent jurisdiction; and shall have power, without warrant, to search any vessel within any of the territorial

waters of the United States, or any vessel of the United States on the high seas, when he has reasonable cause to believe that such vessel is subject to seizure under this section. Any officer, employee, or other person authorized to enforce the provisions of this act shall have power to execute any warrant or process issued by an officer or court of competent jurisdiction for the enforcement of the provisions of this act; and shall have power with a search warrant to search any person, vessel, or place at any time. The judges of the courts established under the laws of the United States, and the United States commissioners, may, within their respective jurisdictions, upon proper oath or affirmation showing probable cause, issue warrants in all such cases. All fur seals and sea otters, or the skins thereof, killed, captured, transported, imported, offered for sale, or possessed contrary to the provisions of this act or of any regulation made pursuant thereto, and any vessel used or employed contrary to the provisions of this act or of any regulation made pursuant thereto, or which it reasonably appears has been or is about to be used or employed in or in aid of the performance of any act forbidden by the provisions of this act or of any regulation made pursuant thereto, together with its tackle, apparel, furniture, appurtenances, and cargo, may, whenever and wherever lawfully found, be seized by any such officer, employee, or other person.

SEC. 11. Except where otherwise expressly provided in this act, any person violating any provision of this act or any regulation made pursuant thereto shall be punished for each such offense, upon conviction thereof, by a fine of not less than \$200 nor more than \$2,000, or by imprisonment for not more than 6 months, or by both fine and imprisonment. All fur seals or sea otters, or the skins thereof, killed, captured, transported, imported, offered for sale, or possessed contrary to any provision of this act or any regulation made pursuant thereto shall be forfeited to the United States and shall be disposed of pursuant to section 5 of this act. Any vessel used or employed contrary to any provision of this act or any regulation made pursuant thereto shall, together with its tackle, apparel, furniture, appurtenances, and cargo, be forfeited to the United States and shall be disposed of as directed by the court having jurisdiction.

SEC. 12. It shall be the duty of all collectors of customs to enforce the provisions of this act with respect to the importation of the skins of fur seal and sea otter.

SEC. 13. Any person or vessel described in section 2 of this act in any of the waters of the North Pacific Ocean designated in any fur-seal agreement, including in any event the waters north of the thirtieth parallel of north latitude and east of the one hundred and eightieth meridian, violating or being about to violate the prohibitions of this act against pelagic sealing may be seized and detained by the naval or other duly commissioned officers of any of the parties to such fur-seal agreement other than the United States, except within the territorial jurisdiction of one of the other said parties, on condition, however, that when such person or vessel is so seized and detained by officers of any party other than the United States, such person or vessel shall be delivered as soon as practicable at the nearest point to the place of seizure, with witnesses and proofs necessary to establish the offense so far as they are under the control of such party, to the proper official of the United States, whose courts alone shall have jurisdiction to try the offense and impose penalties for the same. The said officers of any party to any such fur-seal agreement other than the United States shall seize and detain persons and vessels, as in this section specified, only after such party, by appropriate legislation or otherwise, shall have authorized naval or other officers of the United States duly

commissioned and instructed by the President to that end to seize, detain, and deliver to the proper officers of such party vessels and subjects under the jurisdiction of that government offending against any such fur-seal agreement, or any statute or regulation made by that government to enforce any such fur-seal agreement. Upon the giving of such authority by such party, such naval or other officers of the United States shall have authority to make the seizures, detentions, and deliveries described. The President of the United States shall determine by proclamation when such authority has been given by the other parties to any such fur-seal agreement, and his determination shall be conclusive upon the question; such proclamation may be modified, amended, or revoked by proclamation of the President whenever in his judgment it is deemed expedient.

SEC. 14. It shall be the duty of the President to cause a guard or patrol to be maintained in the waters frequented by the seal herds and sea otter in the protection of which the United States is especially interested, composed of naval or other public vessels of the United States designated by him for such service.

SEC. 15. The Secretary shall have authority to receive on behalf of the United States any fur-seal skins taken by any party to any fur-seal agreement and tendered for delivery by such party in accordance with the terms of such fur-seal agreement, and all skins which are or shall become the property of the United States from any source whatsoever shall be disposed of in accordance with the provisions of section 5 of this act. The Secretary likewise shall have authority to deliver to the authorized agents of any government that is a party to a fur-seal agreement the skins to which such government is entitled under the provisions of such fur-seal agreement, and to do or perform, or cause to be done or performed, any act which the United States is authorized or obliged to do or perform by the provisions of such fur-seal agreement.

SEC. 16. Nothing contained in this act shall apply to the killing, capturing, pursuing, transportation, importation, offering for sale, or possession of fur seals or sea otters, or the skins thereof, for scientific purposes under special permit issued therefor by the Secretary.

SEC. 17. The Secretary shall supervise and direct the administration of this act through the Fish and Wildlife Service and shall make all regulations necessary for the enforcement of this act and any fur-seal agreement. It shall be his duty to provide for the enforcement of all of the provisions of this act and of the regulations issued thereunder, except to the extent otherwise provided for in this act, and to cooperate with other Federal agencies and with the duly authorized officials of the government of any party to any fur-seal agreement in the enforcement of such agreement. Out of such moneys as may be appropriated for such purposes, he shall employ in Washington, D. C., and elsewhere, such individuals and means as he may deem necessary for the administration of this act and of any other function imposed upon him by any fur-seal agreement.

SEC. 18. All acts and parts of acts inconsistent with the provisions of this act, including but not limited to the following, are hereby repealed: Sections 1956, 1959, 1960, and 1961 of the Revised Statutes of the United States; act of February 21, 1893 (27 Stat. 472, ch. 150); act of April 6, 1894 (28 Stat. 52); act of December 29, 1897 (30 Stat. 226, ch. 3); act of April 21, 1910 (36 Stat. 336, ch. 133); act of August 24, 1912 (37 Stat. 499, ch. 373); and joint resolution of June 22, 1916 (39 Stat. 235, ch. 171), all as amended.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, lines 14 and 15: Strike out "District of Columbia."

Page 2, line 16: Insert a comma and the word "convention" after the word "treaty", and insert the word "other" before "agreement."

Page 5, line 2: Insert "fur" before "seals" and "North" before "Pacific Ocean."

Page 5, lines 4 and 5, strike out the words "officers and employees of the Fish and Wildlife Service" and insert in lieu thereof the words "officers, employees, and agents of the United States."

Page 6, line 2, after the word "person" insert the words "other than natives of the said Islands and officers and employees of the Fish and Wildlife Service."

Page 9, line 13: Insert "of" before "any."

Page 10, line 22: Strike out the word "subjects" and insert the word "persons."

Page 11, line 5: Strike out "parties" and insert "party."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

And with the following further committee amendment:

Page 13, at the end add a new section to be known as section 19 as follows:

"SEC. 19. The provisions of this act which implement the Provisional Fur-Seal Agreement of 1942 concluded between the United States of America and Canada shall remain in effect only for the duration of the present emergency and 12 months thereafter unless either the Government of the United States of America or the Government of Canada enacts legislation contrary thereto, or until 12 months after either Government shall have notified the other Government of its intention to terminate the agreement."

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COLE of New York to the committee amendment: On page 13, line 2, strike out "emergency" and insert in lieu thereof "hostilities."

The amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INCREASING PENSIONS FOR CERTAIN WORLD WAR VETERANS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3377, to increase the rate of pension to World War veterans from \$40 to \$50 per month, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. KEAN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, this bill will cost a great deal of money. I believe I am in favor of the proposed legislation, but I do not believe this is the proper kind of a bill to bring up on the Consent Calendar. It should have full debate. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. RANKIN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, let me say to the gentleman from New Jersey that these are men who are totally and permanently disabled and who are now contending that they are unable to sustain themselves on the small compensation allowed them. They are paid less than the soldiers of any other war. If they were Spanish-American War veterans they would be getting from \$60 to \$85 a month. They have asked for this in-

crease to \$50, and for an increase to \$60 a month for those who have been held to be totally and permanently disabled for 10 years or who are totally disabled and have also reached the age of 65. This would be putting those men merely on a parity with the Spanish-American War veterans. They are just as disabled today, if they are totally and permanently disabled, as they will ever be. They feel that this proposed legislation is necessary.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. PRIEST. Is not the request based entirely on the increased cost of living?

Mr. RANKIN. Certainly, that is one thing. Another thing, it is based on the fact that these men are growing older. Many of them are above 65 and many of them above 75 years of age. They are being paid not more than two-thirds of what they would get if they were Spanish-American War veterans of the same age.

Mr. PRIEST. Does the gentleman have an estimate of what the annual increase in cost would be as a result of this measure?

Mr. RANKIN. I do not believe I have the estimate here, but that was gone into rather thoroughly before the committee. I may say to the gentleman that it will not break the Government by any means.

Mr. PRIEST. I am sure of that; I just wanted to have the estimate at this point for the sake of the Record.

Mr. RANKIN. We had hearings before the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation and the representatives of all the various veterans' organizations appeared in favor of this measure.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. May I call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that we have pending in the House today for further consideration a bill to allow to the wives as dependents of the present personnel of the Army now in combat the sum of \$50 a month. Thousands and thousands of these women are not at all dependent. Many of them hold jobs or have incomes. While I am opposing the raising of any of those allowances and shall continue to do so, I think that this raise of \$10 to our World War veterans is amply justified.

Mr. RANKIN. These men are totally and permanently disabled. Many of them are totally and permanently disabled as a result of their service in the World War. However, because of conditions that prevailed right after the war they were not able to prove their disabilities or did not want to prove their disabilities because they hoped to get well. They are patriotic men who did not desire to get anything from the Government, until the time passed for them to make their proof. Therefore, they could not even be put on the roll as presumptively service-connected.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WRIGHT. Does not the gentleman believe that if the cost of living as far as foodstuffs is concerned is increased the provisions in the gentleman's bill for an increase will be inadequate?

Mr. RANKIN. I may say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that they may be inadequate for the veterans, but it seems to me that they are more than adequate for the objectors. I did the very best I could with this bill, and I think it ought to pass. When you have examined the bill carefully, I do not believe there will be three men in the House who will object the next time it is brought up.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Does the gentleman have any estimate as to the number of veterans who would be involved in this action?

Mr. RANKIN. No. I can get it, however. It is in the hearings. I do not happen to have it before me.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. It would not be such a considerable sum?

Mr. RANKIN. Certainly not.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. As has been pointed out, we are giving to the wives or other dependents of soldiers in this war \$50 a month. Under the bill we have pending now we are even giving many of the divorced wives \$42 a month. I think this proposition is fair and just and ought to be passed.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I must object to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey that the bill be passed over without prejudice, because that will merely prolong the proceeding. I ask that the bill be considered now.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, for the reasons I have already given, I object.

ARTIFICIAL LIMBS OR OTHER APPLIANCES

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3176, to regulate the furnishing of artificial limbs or other appliances to retired officers and enlisted men of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard and to certain civilian employees of the military and naval forces of the Regular Establishment.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 4 of Public Law No. 193, Seventy-sixth Congress, approved July 19, 1939, as amended by Public Law No. 365, Seventy-seventh Congress, approved December 22, 1941, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 4. In the administration of laws pertaining to veterans, retired officers, and enlisted men of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, who served honorably during a war period as recognized by the Veterans' Administration, shall be, and are entitled to hospitalization and domiciliary care in the same manner and to the same extent as veterans of any war are now or may hereafter be furnished hospitalization or domiciliary care by the Veterans' Administration and subject to those provisions of paragraph VI (A) of Veterans Regulation No. 6 (c), which provide for reduction of monetary benefits to veterans having neither wife, child, nor dependent parent while being fur-

nished hospital treatment, institutional, or domiciliary care.

"Any retired officer or enlisted man of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard who lost a limb or the use thereof through injury or disease incurred or contracted in line of duty in the military or naval service at any time, may be provided with an artificial limb or other appliance found by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to be reasonably necessary in medical judgment for such injury or disease, included necessary transportation to effect the fitting thereof, upon receipt of claim under such regulations as the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs may prescribe. No commutation in lieu of such artificial limb or other appliance shall be payable on and after the date of this enactment."

SEC. 2. The United States Employees' Compensation Commission, under such regulations as the Commission may prescribe, is hereby authorized to furnish any civilian employee of the military or naval service, Regular Establishment, who lost a limb or the use thereof through injury or disease incurred or contracted in line of duty as such prior to September 7, 1916, with an artificial limb or other appliance, or commutation in lieu thereof, at least once in every 3 years, upon the application of the person entitled thereto, or someone on his behalf, including necessary transportation to effect the fitting thereof and the compensation fund, established pursuant to section 35 of the act approved September 7, 1916 (U. S. C., title 5, sec. 785), shall be available for expenditures under this section: *Provided*, That the commutation payable to any civilian employee in lieu of such artificial limb or other appliance shall be in the amount last paid to such employee under laws repealed by section 3 of this act.

SEC. 3. The act entitled "An act to amend an act entitled 'An act supplementary to an act to provide for furnishing artificial limbs to disabled soldiers' approved June 30, 1870," approved June 8, 1872 (17 Stat. 338); the act entitled "An act to regulate the issue of artificial limbs to disabled soldiers, seamen, and others," approved August 15, 1876 (19 Stat. 203, 204; U. S. C., 1940 edition, title 38, secs. 241, 242, 245); part of paragraph following semicolon making provision for direct payment of commutation under subject "Artificial limbs" under heading "Miscellaneous objects" in the act entitled "An act making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1892, and for other purposes," approved March 3, 1891 (26 Stat. 979; U. S. C., 1940 edition, title 38, sec. 244); section 4787 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 edition, title 38, secs. 241-242); section 4788 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 edition, title 38, sec. 243); section 4789 of the Revised Statutes; section 4790 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 edition, title 38, sec. 243); section 4791 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 edition, title 38, sec. 246); the proviso under the subject "Artificial limbs" under the heading "Medical Department" in the act entitled "An act making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921, and for other purposes," approved June 5, 1920 (41 Stat. 901; U. S. C., 1940 edition, title 38, sec. 242); section 1176 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., 1940 edition, title 38, sec. 247); section 1177 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., 1940 edition, title 38, sec. 248); section 1178 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 edition, title 38, sec. 249; title 31, sec. 583 (9)); the act entitled "An act to amend the act entitled 'An act to provide for furnishing trusses to disabled soldiers,' approved May 28, 1872," approved March 3, 1879 (20 Stat. 353; U. S. C., 1940 edition, title 38, secs. 247 and 250), are

hereby repealed, and any other acts, or parts of acts, in conflict or inconsistent with the provisions of this act, are hereby repealed to the extent of such conflict or inconsistency.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 2, line 19, strike out "appliance" and insert "appliance."

Line 22, strike out "included" and insert "including."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TO INCREASE COMPENSATION TO DISABLED VETERANS, ETC.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3356) to provide for an increase in the monthly rates of compensation or pension payable to disabled veterans for service-incurred disability, and the widows and children under Public Law 484, Seventy-third Congress, June 28, 1934, as amended.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. This bill substantially changes the rate of compensation of disabled veterans, as well as the widows and dependents of those veterans. The bill is in the same category as the other bill that we have just discussed. I ask unanimous consent that the bill go over without prejudice.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object, to say to the gentleman from New York that these are service-connected disabled veterans, whether disabled by gunshot wounds, or other injuries in this war or the last war. Many of them are struggling along on compensation too small for their subsistence, and I submit, that it is certainly incongruous, to say the least, to increase the allowances to which the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY] referred a moment ago, to the extent proposed, and then refuse to increase the compensation of these battle-scarred veterans, of these tubercular veterans, of these insane, shell-shocked veterans who are entitled to our highest consideration.

Mr. COLE of New York. Of course, the gentleman understands that our objection is only to the manner of the procedure in the passage of the bill and not to the merits of the bill. When the gentleman referred to the bill referred to by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY], he was not aware of the fact, probably, that the gentleman from Kentucky went to the Rules Committee to get a rule, which permitted 4 hours' debate, and the bill will be taken up today later, so that 2 whole days of discussion will have been had upon that bill and it was not sought to be passed by unanimous consent.

Mr. RANKIN. And I will say to the gentleman, that I will be glad to have a roll call on both of these bills. I hope we can do so. Will that satisfy the gentleman from New York?

Mr. COLE of New York. My only objection is in trying to pass a bill of this

size and importance, as to which I feel every Member of the House should be advised, by unanimous consent.

Mr. RANKIN. And I say to the gentleman that they may come down here and debate this other bill for 4 hours and the chances are that there will not be 1 man out of 10 who will have heard all of those 4 hours of debate, and some Members will not hear any of the debate, because they know what is in the bill, and have their minds already made up. We might debate this bill from now until Saturday night, and we would not change the votes of half a dozen Members, because there will not be a half dozen Members who will vote against it on a roll call. So we might as well have the roll call now.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes.

Mr. CASE. Occasionally there is some value in debate of these bills. I have a copy of the bill before me and I notice that it is proposed to offer an amendment, which would redefine widows, so that it may be that contained in section 6 of Public Law No. 144, Seventy-eighth Congress, passed July 13, 1943. We now find that in that particular act there was some language which apparently has reduced the pensions of Spanish War and Indian war veterans who might have taken a furlough and gone out from the Veterans' Administration or the State soldiers' homes, on the particular day, while those who were present in the institutions, and who on that particular day were not away, did not have their pensions reduced. The particular language in that particular bill reduced the pensions of those veterans who happened to be away from the institution. So that there is a real value in having these bills debated.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I object.

FURNISHING TRANSPORTATION FOR VEHICLES OF VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION EMPLOYEES

The clerk called the bill (S. 964) to provide for furnishing transportation in Government-owned automotive vehicles for employees of the Veterans' Administration at field stations in the absence of adequate public or private transportation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. This bill would provide for transportation at Government expense of employees of the Veterans' Administration and their facilities in the field. There is nothing in the report that I have that would indicate what the cost of this would be.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman from Tennessee is in error.

Mr. PRIEST. It may be in the hearings, but I have not had access to the hearings.

Mr. RANKIN. This bill has already passed the Senate. The bill provides:

That during the present war and not exceeding 6 months after the termination of the war, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, whenever he finds such action to be necessary for the efficient conduct of the affairs of his administration, and under such regulations as he may prescribe, is authorized to utilize automotive equipment of the Veterans' Administration to transport its employees between field stations and nearest adequate public transportation at such reasonable rates of fare for the service furnished as he may establish.

It is not furnished free of charge, it is paid for, and the Administrator tells me that it is necessary. It certainly will not cost the Government anything.

Mr. PRIEST. They pay their fare when transported in vehicles furnished by the Veterans' Administration?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes.

Mr. PRIEST. I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object, although I shall not object to the bill.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman has softened so rapidly I wonder if he would mind returning to the other bill.

Mr. KEAN. This bill provides for the furnishing of transportation to employees. I am wondering whether it might not be possible to provide that if there is room in the busses those relatives who want to visit veterans in the hospitals may use the busses, which might run some times empty. Has the gentleman given thought to that?

Mr. RANKIN. I think it is a pretty hard matter to look at a man and tell who he is related to. I am afraid that might throw these busses open to a great deal of imposition on the part of people who simply want to use them. I think we ought to confine it to employees of the Administration. I will say to the gentleman from New Jersey I think it would be unwise to make that change.

Mr. KEAN. I am sure the gentleman has looked into the matter very carefully.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill? There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That during the present war and not exceeding 6 months after the termination of the war, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, whenever he finds such action to be necessary for the efficient conduct of the affairs of his Administration, and under such regulations as he may prescribe, is authorized to utilize automotive equipment of the Veterans' Administration to transport its employees between field stations and nearest adequate public transportation at such reasonable rates of fare for the service furnished as he may establish. All moneys collected as fares from such employees shall be accounted for and shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of miscellaneous receipts. The authority herein granted the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs shall be exercised with respect to any station only after determination by the Office of Defense Transportation that

existing private and other facilities are not and cannot be rendered adequate by other means, and that its exercise will result in the most efficient method of supplying transportation to the personnel concerned and a utilization of transportation facilities consistent with the plan, policies, and purposes of the Office of Defense Transportation.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONVEYANCE OF HARRISON PARK IN THE CITY OF VINCENNES TO VINCENNES UNIVERSITY

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3306, to authorize the conveyance of Harrison Park in the city of Vincennes to Vincennes University.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, several years ago the United States Government conveyed to the city of Vincennes, Ind., a certain tract of land to be used for park purposes, with the condition that if that land should no longer be used as a park, the title should revert to the United States. This bill authorizes the city of Vincennes to turn that property over to Vincennes University, with a provision in the deed that if it is no longer used as a university, the title shall revert to the city of Vincennes to be used as a park, but it does not reestablish the Federal Government's reversionary interest in the land. I have prepared an amendment which I think will correct this defect and have discussed it with the chairman of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, who is agreeable to the amendment. Therefore I withdraw my reservation of objection and will offer the amendment later.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding the provisions of section 2 of the act entitled "An act to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to sell certain real estate belonging to the United States, and vesting the title to certain other lands in the city of Vincennes, in the State of Indiana, and for other purposes," approved March 3, 1881, the city of Vincennes is authorized to convey all its right, title, and interest in and to the tract of land known as Harrison Park, title to which was vested in such city by such section 2, and all improvements on such land, to the board of trustees for the Vincennes University. The conveyance executed by the city of Vincennes shall contain the express condition that if such board of trustees shall at any time cease to use such property for school purposes, or shall alienate or attempt to alienate such property, title thereto shall revert to the city of Vincennes, and thereafter such property shall be used only as a park or for some other public purpose: *Provided,* That, in the event such conveyance involves the transfer of ownership or control over the Old Territorial Capitol Building or Legislative Hall, which was removed to a site in the park in 1919, the transfer of the aforesaid park land shall be contingent upon the making of arrangements satisfactory to the Secretary of the Interior for the preservation of the structure.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COLE of New York: On page 2, line 7, after "Vincennes", strikes out "and thereafter such property shall be used as a park or for some other public purpose" and insert "subject to the same limitations as now exist."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING NAVAL AVIATION CADET ACT OF 1942

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 1113, to amend section 11 of the Naval Aviation Cadet Act of 1942.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 11 of the Naval Aviation Cadet Act of 1942 (56 Stat. 738; 34 U. S. C. 850), be, and the same is hereby, amended to read as follows: "When first commissioned pursuant to this act officers shall be paid a uniform allowance of \$150 if commissioned as ensigns in the Naval Reserve, and of \$250 if commissioned as second lieutenants in the Marine Corps Reserve: *Provided*, That any officer who has heretofore received the cash uniform gratuity of \$150 provided in section 302 of the Naval Reserve Act of 1938 (52 Stat. 1180) shall not be entitled to this uniform allowance."

SEC. 2. This act shall become effective as of August 4, 1942.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING NAVAL RESERVE ACT OF 1938

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 1132, to amend the Naval Reserve Act of 1938 so as to provide for the payment of a uniform gratuity to certain officers recalled to active duty.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Naval Reserve Act of 1938, as amended, is hereby further amended by inserting between sections 310 and 311 (52 Stat. 1183; 34 U. S. C. 8551) a new section 310a, to read as follows:

"Sec. 310a. Commissioned and warrant officers on the honorary retired list of the Naval Reserve without pay shall, upon first reporting for active duty (other than for physical examination) in time of war or national emergency pursuant to orders of competent authority, be paid the sum of \$250 as a uniform allowance for the purchase of required uniforms in lieu of any other uniform gratuity allowed by law: *Provided*, That there shall be deducted from this allowance the amount of any uniform gratuity paid such officer within the 4 years immediately preceding his recall to active duty."

SEC. 2. This act shall be effective as of September 8, 1939.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NAVAL MINE DEPOT RESERVATION AT YORKTOWN, VA.

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 1170, authorizing the conveyance to the State

of Virginia for highway purposes only, of a portion of the Naval Mine Depot Reservation at Yorktown, Va.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized to convey to the State of Virginia, for highway purposes only, upon such terms and conditions as he may prescribe, all right, title, and interest of the United States of America in and to a strip or parcel of land of the Naval Mine Depot Reservation at Yorktown, York County, Va., containing 8.03 acres, more or less, metes and bounds description of which is on file in the Navy Department.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NAVY NURSE CORPS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2976, to grant military rank to certain members of the Navy Nurse Corps.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

REIMBURSEMENT OF OFFICERS, ENLISTED MEN AND OTHERS IN THE NAVAL SERVICE FOR PROPERTY LOST IN SUCH SERVICE

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3223, to provide for reimbursement of officers, enlisted men, and others in the naval service of the United States for property lost, damaged, or destroyed in such service.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Navy and, subject to appeal to the Secretary of the Navy, such other officer or officers as he may designate for such purposes and under such regulations as he may prescribe, are hereby authorized to consider, and to ascertain, adjust, determine, and pay, in an amount not exceeding \$1,000, any claim filed under oath of the commissioned, appointed, enrolled, and enlisted personnel of the Navy and Marine Corps, and of the Coast Guard when operating as a part of the Navy, and of civilian employees of the Naval Establishment, for loss, damage, or destruction of their private personal property occurring on or after December 7, 1941, when such loss, damage, or destruction is not due to fault or negligence on the part of the claimant and has occurred or shall hereafter occur under the following circumstances:

First. When the loss, damage, or destruction is due to operations of war, shipwreck, or other marine disaster, or the wreck of an aircraft or other disaster thereto: *Provided*, That the term "marine disaster" as used herein shall include an accident occurring on board a vessel.

Second. When the loss, damage, or destruction is in consequence of the serviceman or employee having given his attention to the saving of the life of another, or of property belonging to the United States.

Third. When such property is lost, damaged, or destroyed by reason of being shipped on board an unseaworthy vessel by order of an officer authorized to give such order or direct such shipment; or is lost, damaged, or

destroyed, whether or not due to negligence on the part of Government personnel, while in shipment pursuant to orders issued by competent authority, but where the property was transported by a common carrier, the reimbursement shall be limited to the extent of such loss, damage, or destruction over and above the amount recoverable from such carrier.

Fourth. When such property is lost, damaged, or destroyed by reason of being furnished at the direction of competent authority to another person under conditions of immediate and urgent distress.

Reimbursement may be made in all such cases for loss, damage, or destruction of such articles as are required to be possessed and used by officers, enlisted men, and others, in connection with their service or employment, and such additional items of personal property as the Secretary of the Navy shall determine to have been reasonably and properly in the place when they were lost, damaged, or destroyed, in consequence of the service or employment in which the serviceman or employee was engaged.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Navy is authorized to reimburse the claimant in kind out of available Government property, or to pay the amount, not exceeding \$1,000 in any one case, determined to be due on claims under this act, out of any appropriation available for the purpose. Claims exceeding \$1,000 which the Secretary of the Navy considers meritorious may be reported to Congress for its consideration.

SEC. 3. Separation from the naval service or establishment shall not bar the authority to consider, ascertain, adjust, determine, and pay any claim otherwise falling within the provisions of this act which accrued prior to such separation. In the event of the death of any person designated in section 1 hereof, whether occurring prior or subsequent to the time any loss, destruction, or damage occurs, reimbursement may be made to any dependent relative, as determined by the Secretary of the Navy.

SEC. 4. Existing claims shall be presented within 2 years from the date of this act and all such claims hereafter arising shall be presented within 2 years from the occurrence of the loss, destruction, or damage, except that any person missing who is not willfully absent, or any person who is a prisoner in the hands of the enemy, or who is interned in a neutral country, shall in addition be allowed 1 year from the time of return to the jurisdiction of the United States in which to file such claim.

SEC. 5. The provisions of this act shall apply to the personnel of the Coast Guard, military, and civil, when the Coast Guard is not operating as a part of the Navy. In such case the Secretary of the Treasury shall have and exercise as to claims of the personnel of the Coast Guard the authority conferred by this act upon the Secretary of the Navy, and payment or reimbursement in kind of such claims shall be made from appropriations available to the Treasury Department, which appropriations are hereby authorized.

SEC. 6. The provisions of this act shall apply to the personnel of the Coast and Geodetic Survey and Public Health Service when serving with the Navy.

SEC. 7. The determination of claims under the provisions of this act shall be final as to all matters necessary to the establishment and payment or settlement of any claim filed hereunder, and acceptance of payment thereof or reimbursement in kind therefor shall conclusively operate as acceptance of the determination thereof. No right to prosecute a claim or action before any court or agency of the United States, except as herein provided, shall accrue to any person hereunder: *Provided*, That claims arising in the manner indicated in this act and which have been

settled under the terms of a previously existing law shall be regarded as finally determined and no other or further right of recovery under the provisions hereof shall accrue to persons whose claims have been so settled.

Sec. 8. The appropriations available to the Navy Department and the Coast Guard for the payment of claims under the provisions of the act of October 6, 1917 (40 Stat. 389), as amended, are hereby made available for the payment or reimbursement of claims determined under the provisions of this act.

Sec. 9. The said act approved October 6, 1917 (40 Stat. 389), entitled "An act to provide for the reimbursement of officers, enlisted men, and others in the naval service of the United States for property lost or destroyed in such service," as amended, is hereby repealed.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, lines 7 and 8, strike out "in an amount not exceeding \$1,000."

Page 3, line 11, after the word "property" insert "including money or currency."

Page 3, line 15, insert before the period at the end thereof the following: "Provided, That reimbursement may be made for loss of money or currency only when such money or currency has been deposited for safekeeping as provided by regulations promulgated by the Secretary of the Navy or as provided by orders of the commanding officer."

Page 3, lines 18 and 19, strike out "not exceeding \$1,000 in any one case."

Page 3, lines 20 to 22, inclusive, strike out "Claims exceeding \$1,000 which the Secretary of the Navy considers meritorious may be reported to Congress for its consideration."

Page 5, strike out all of section 7, preceding the word "claims" in line 12 and capitalize the word "claims" in line 12.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMISSION WARRANT OFFICER AND WARRANT OFFICER, UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3224, to establish the grades of commissioned warrant officer and warrant officer in the United States Marine Corps, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in lieu of H. R. 3224 the House consider Senate bill 1350, which is identical.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the grades of chief marine gunner, chief quartermaster clerk, chief pay clerk, marine gunner, quartermaster clerk, and pay clerk in the United States Marine Corps are abolished, and in lieu thereof there are hereby established the commissioned warrant and warrant grades of commissioned warrant officer and warrant officer.

Sec. 2. From and after the approval of this act, and without the issuance of new commissions or warrants, all Marine Corps personnel in the commissioned warrant grades of chief marine gunner, chief quartermaster clerk, and chief pay clerk shall be known and entered upon the Naval Register as "com-

missioned warrant officers", and all Marine Corps personnel in the warrant grades of marine gunner, quartermaster clerk, and pay clerk shall be known and entered upon the Naval Register as "warrant officers."

Sec. 3. Nothing contained in this act shall change or modify in any respect the permanent or temporary status of any officer, nor the rank, precedence, rights, benefits, privileges, pay, allowances, or emoluments to which he is, or may hereafter be, entitled.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H. R. 3224) was laid on the table.

SETTLEMENT OF ACCOUNTS OF DECEASED OFFICERS AND ENLISTED MEN, NAVY AND MARINE CORPS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3225, to amend the act of May 27, 1908, as amended, authorizing settlement of accounts of deceased officers and enlisted men of the Navy and Marine Corps.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act approved May 27, 1908 (35 Stat. 317), as amended (52 Stat. 352; 34 U. S. C. 941), is hereby further amended by striking out the words "five hundred" appearing in line 35, page 373, Thirty-fifth Statutes at Large, and inserting in lieu thereof the words "one thousand."

With the following committee amendment:

At the end thereof strike out the period, insert a comma and the following: "and by changing the colon after the word 'stripes' in line 47 to a period and inserting 'Where the amount due the decedent's estate is \$1,000 or more and no demand is presented by a duly appointed legal representative of the estate, the accounting officers may allow \$1,000 of the amount due to the estate to the widow or legal heirs in the order of precedence hereinabove set forth.'"

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NAVY AVIATION CADET ACT OF 1942 AMENDED

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3220, to amend section 12 of the Naval Aviation Cadet Act of 1942.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 12 of the Aviation Cadet Act of 1942 (56 Stat. 738, 34 U. S. C. 850k) is hereby amended by inserting after the comma following the word "Navy", in line 6, the following: "or, if no beneficiary has been specially designated, the representative of the officer's estate."

Sec. 2. This act shall be effective from August 4, 1942.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, following the comma at the end thereof insert the following: "the widow of such officer, and if there be no widow, his child or children, and if there be neither widow nor child."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING PIPE LINES FOR STEAM-HEATING PURPOSES

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 3208) to permit construction, maintenance, and use of certain pipe lines for steam-heating purposes in the District of Columbia, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 2, line 2, after "use" insert "not more than two."

Page 2, after line 15, insert "Any repairs to streets, highways, or other public property necessitated by construction or alterations of said pipe lines shall be made in a manner satisfactory to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, at the expense of Lansburgh and Brother."

The Senate amendments were agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

APPLICATION OF EXCESS-PROFITS TAX TO CERTAIN PRODUCTION BONUS PAYMENTS

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 2888) relating to the application of the excess-profits tax to certain production bonus payments, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

On page 3, strike out lines 11, 12, and 13, and insert:

"Sec. 4. The amendments made by this act shall be effective as if they were a part of section 209 of the Revenue Act of 1942, on the date of its enactment."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ALLOWANCES AND ALLOTMENTS FOR DEPENDENTS OF MILITARY PERSONNEL

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (S. 1279) to amend the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act of 1942, as amended, so as to liberalize the family allowances, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further

consideration of the bill S. 1279, with Mr. BULWINKLE in the chair.

Mr. BLACKNEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BLACKNEY. Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Military Affairs in reporting the bill pending before us today stated:

We recognize the fact that the American home is the basic institution of our social system, and that dependency is the fundamental principle underlying the statutory laws of this Government, relating to the induction of men into the armed service.

I am heartily in favor of liberalizing family allowances in order to preserve the morale of our soldier boys and their families, and in order to take away from them the fear of want.

We have today more than 11,000,000 men in military service. Our boys throughout the world are doing a splendid job. It naturally follows that those who have dependents home have been worried as to whether the allotments now provided are sufficient. With the increasing of these family allowances our soldier boys, throughout this country and throughout the world, will have that fear alleviated, which, in itself, will tend to build up their morale.

It is estimated that by the 1st of January there will be at least 5,000,000 people, relations of our soldier boys, receiving these allowances. While we all agree that the United States should curtail to the limit all unnecessary expenses not conducive to the war effort, yet I think we can further agree that the liberalizing of family allowances does not come under that category. The least we can do to show our appreciation for the splendid services of American soldier boys throughout this country and throughout the world is to do everything humanely possible to preserve their home morale by bringing aid and assistance to the men, women, and children who are dependents of these soldier boys.

This bill, or its substitute, providing for a liberalization of family allowances, should pass.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, may I say to the Members on this side of the House that if there are any others to whom I can extend the same privilege I shall be pleased to do so now.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SPRINGER].

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, during this war, and during the time our boys and men are fighting for liberty and freedom, our obligation and duty is to see that their wives, children, and dependents are properly cared for. We must fulfill that obligation. However, in passing legislation on this subject of making allowances for the dependents of the military personnel we must not be unmindful of the financial condition of our country and of the burden which this legislation will impose upon the people generally. We have an empty Treasury, and the huge debt that is now upon the

people of this country is far beyond the contemplation of any one of us. While the measure which has been presented here by the Military Affairs Committee, of the House, strikes a median line insofar as payments to dependents are concerned. It is my firm conviction that this measure takes cognizance of the need for larger payments to dependents, and, at the same time, it has given careful consideration to the financial condition of our country and the ability to pay the added burden which this measure will impose.

Mr. Chairman, we recognize the fact that our men who are fighting on every battle front must not be faced with the fear that their families and dependents are in want. They have one supreme job, and that is to win this war, and to win it as quickly as possible. Their attention should not be diverted from that objective. And, certainly, while the men in our Army, Navy, and Marine Corps are measuring their supreme effort against a ruthless foe—while they are making that great sacrifice, and some of them have already made the supreme sacrifice by giving all—they should not be faced with a constant fear that their loved ones are in need and in want. As they go forward, we want them to know that their dependents are cared for by a grateful Nation; that their children have the things they need, and that they are having the opportunities in life to which they are so justly entitled.

On the other hand, the people of this Nation realize the frightful financial condition of our country. Those in power have charted a course which has led us into an unprecedented indebtedness, and this debt will be the obligation of all of the people in this Nation. All will have their part to pay. Those who are now serving in the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps will have their portion of this terrific indebtedness to pay. This is not the debt of any one, or of any class or group—but it is the debt of every citizen of the United States of America. Every dollar that is spent now, means that the same must hereafter be repaid with interest. Every serviceman will face the burden of the payment of his part of this debt when he returns from the service. Therefore, it is entirely proper that the measure of the absolute need and necessity be taken into consideration as we debate this bill, and as we ponder over the future.

The unalterable and the undeniable facts stand before us that we will face the high tide of debt when this war is over. I for one do not want the soldiers, sailors, and marines to return to the arts and trades of civil life with an unsurmountable burden of debt upon them as long as they may live. I hope they may have presented to them the opportunity to make progress in a free land, where their ability and their experience may carry them far and that their children may have an equal opportunity to make great progress in the future. While we consider this legislation, let us approach the final hour when this question is decided with the full understanding that we do not want to shackle and manacle

the hands of those who fought by adding to their future burdens greater taxes. We will remember that whatever added burden we impose here and now will increase the taxes upon every citizen in our country. The men who are working in our factories and mills, our businessmen, our farmers, and the people of every walk in life will feel the weight of this burden, as they have suffered the shock of every other tax burden which has been imposed upon the people. That burden has now reached the point where it hurts. Every dollar that is wasted, every dollar that is spent for nonessential and needless things, every dollar that is used to pay the wage or salary of a needless and unnecessary employee by the Government, every useless board, bureau, and agency of Government which is now absorbing the money and resources of our people, every useless project advocated by those in power, has resulted in an increase of our huge debt. Those in power must stop the waste, and they must put an end to extravagance; they must forever demand that \$1 in value be received for each and every dollar that is spent; they must weed out the great surplus of needless and unnecessary employees now on the Federal pay roll; they must get down to business, in a businesslike way, and run our Government on a sound and economical manner. I am convinced if this policy should be adopted and followed there could be a very material decrease in spending, which would be far in excess of any amount that would be called upon to increase the pay to dependents of the men in our armed forces during this war.

Mr. Chairman, as we go forward today facing an unknown future, while we must grant that which is needed and necessary for the dependents of our fighting forces, yet we must realize that our decision will have its ultimate effect upon the people of this Nation. All must participate in the final discharge of that debt, and we must meet the obligation of our Government's payments in the light of that final day when the people—all of them—are called upon to respond.

Lastly, in the final analysis of things, we must approach this problem with the will and determination to aid the dependents and to conserve insofar as possible our resources for war. The measure which is here presented from the Military Affairs Committee meets that demand, I am convinced.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF].

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I am heartily in accord with the provisions of the bill now before the Committee. This bill does partial justice to the dependents of men in the armed forces now serving on many different battlefields throughout the world.

I congratulate the Committee on Military Affairs and thank them on behalf of the men in the armed forces throughout the world and for their dependents, for bringing this measure before the Committee.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. ANGELL].

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, the bill now under consideration which has for its purpose the amendments to the servicemen's dependents' allowance act of 1942 so as to liberalize family allowances, is not only important legislation, but legislation that should receive the unanimous support of every Member of the House. Many fathers have been drafted into the service and the military authorities are now demanding that pre-Pearl Harbor fathers be drafted into service along with unmarried men. This means that there will be an increased number of children of servicemen who will be without means of support in many cases. We should not only make ample provision for the care of the wives and dependents of servicemen in order that no hardships may result by reason of the breadwinner and the father being called to the colors, but also to relieve the fathers in the service of their anxiety and mental suffering and worry over the problem of support for their wives and children left at home.

In order to keep our fighting men at full efficiency and keep the morale of our men at the front at the highest point, we should by all means make certain that adequate provision is made for their dependents at home. It is my purpose to support the amendments to the committee bill, which I understand will be offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CLASON], so that the bill as amended will conform to the recent act passed in the other body earlier this month.

The increased cost of living under war conditions has made it necessary that increases for servicemen's dependents should likewise be provided. The allowances provided in the Clason amendments are minimums that we should provide. I hope that the Clason amendments will receive the support of the House and the bill as amended will then be passed.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. CUNNINGHAM].

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I am very much in favor of this bill and believe it is the least we can do for these dependent people.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROBSON].

Mr. ROBSON of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of S. 1279 as amended by the substitute favorably reported by the Committee on Military Affairs of the House, with the exception that I shall support the amendment to be offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CLASON], a Republican member of the Military Affairs Committee, in order to bring the House substitute bill in line with the action taken by the Senate. The Senate bill provides \$50 for the wife, \$30 for the first child, and \$20 for each additional child. The House substitute bill provides \$50 for the wife, \$25 for the first child, \$20 for the second child, and \$15 for each additional child.

The Senate adopted its bill with the rates to the wife and children as provided in the Clason amendment by a vote of 78 to 1. I sincerely trust that this allotment bill for the dependents of our servicemen may be approved by the unanimous vote of the House. This bill makes no change in allotments to wives.

The Military Affairs Committees of the House and the Senate held extensive hearings as to the amount necessary to maintain the wife and children of our servicemen. Investigations were made in 33 of the important cities in the country, and in smaller cities and towns and in the rural sections. It would be impractical to fix various different amounts of aid to different individual wives, children and other dependents. Under such a plan the delay would be such as to deny relief to the wives, children and other dependents of our servicemen, therefore, it was necessary to arrive at allotments that would meet the general situation, and this, of course, falls somewhat less than the requirements in our large cities and in some of our smaller cities, and it might be a little more than is really necessary in the rural sections of the country.

This legislation has been brought about by reason of the decision of the administration and those in charge of our armed forces to draft large numbers of fathers and to eliminate the deferment of men on account of dependents. This increase in rates is largely due to the fact that we will have hundreds of thousands and perhaps a million or more fathers in the service. Their wives and children must be cared for, and inasmuch as fathers and others will be drafted regardless of dependents, it is up to the Congress to provide adequate allotments to wives, children, and dependent parents, sisters, and brothers. Under the present law there can be no allotment for dependents of soldiers and sailors in the first, second, and third grades. These three grades must take care of their own dependents. This allotment law does not apply to officers in the Army or Navy. It applies solely and only to the several grades of enlisted men and women. Under the existing law, the dependents of soldiers and sailors in the fourth, fifth, sixth, and seventh grades are allowed dependency benefits. This would include buck privates up to and including the line sergeants, with comparable grades in the Navy. This amendment will grant benefits to staff, technical, master, and first sergeants, provided that they forego the \$1.25 per day for quarters allowance for dependents, and it is likely that all or practically all of our servicemen in the first, second, and third grades will take advantage of this amendment. The law is further amended by allowing the children of divorced parents \$42 for the first child and \$20 for the second child. Under the present law the children of divorced parents could not receive any more than the court had fixed in divorce proceedings for their support. We have cases in our own district where children are allowed not more than \$5 each per month. This amendment places them on the same footing as children whose

parents are not divorced. If the court in a divorce proceeding granted alimony to the wife, and the judgment of the court is still in force, the ex-wife under this measure would draw an allotment not to exceed \$42 per month, but if in the divorce proceeding she received no alimony, she will be entitled to no dependency benefits under this act. If the children of the divorced parents are not living with their mother, then the person who has them in custody would be entitled to receive these benefits for their care and support. There are three classes of dependents:

a. Wives and children.

b. Parents, brothers, and sisters.

b-1. Parents, brothers, and sisters.

The reason we have b and b-1 is that in administering the Dependency Act the parents, sisters, and brothers come under section b, provided they are dependent upon the serviceman for a substantial portion of their support, and it is held that substantial portion means 30 percent or more and less than 50 percent of dependency. Class b-1 includes the parents, or either of them, and the brothers and sisters, or either or all of them, who are dependent upon the serviceman for the chief portion of support. It has been held by those administering the dependency laws that the words "chief portion" means more than 50 percent—in fact, as much as 56 percent. Class b dependent or dependents are payable only when there is no allowance payable to class b-1 dependents, and class b cannot receive more than \$37 per month. Class b-1 dependent or dependents are allowed \$50 to a parent where there is no brother or sister; two parents with no brother or sister will receive \$68; one parent and one brother or sister \$68, and \$11 for each additional brother or sister; two parents and one brother or sister \$79, with an additional \$11 for each additional brother or sister; brother or sister but no parent \$42, with an additional \$11 for each additional brother or sister.

This bill makes another change in the present dependency law. When a man is inducted into the Army or Navy, he at once makes a list of his dependents and the checks are sent out during that same month and within a few days after his induction to the dependents of the enlisted man; this is for his first month's service and nothing is taken out of his pay. Of course, the wife and children will not have to show dependency, but the parents and brothers and sisters must at once establish their dependency or they will not receive these benefits in the future. The plan of taking care of the dependents of the servicemen during the first month is made necessary because of the delay that has followed the present plan. In my experience we have found many wives, children, and other dependents going for months before they receive any allotment checks, and thousands of wives, children, and other dependents had to depend upon public charity waiting for their dependency benefits to come in. I think this is a most desirable amendment. Only those who have been called from their families and homes and

work, business, and professions can fully appreciate what it means to be taken away suddenly and remain away from their loved ones for a year or several years, and to have their lives and plans disrupted, and how many of us can fully appreciate the grief, loneliness, and despair of the wives, children, and other dependents who are left behind. Our fighting men should be made to feel that this great Government is providing ample care and protection for their wives, children, and dependent fathers and mothers. They should not have to worry over their loved ones being the objects of public charity and wanting in the necessities of life. This measure should greatly bolster the morale of our fighting men in this great and bloody war. We cannot do less than provide this care and help for their loved ones, and I indulge the hope that not a single vote will be cast against this bill with the Clason amendment incorporated in it.

Mr. Chairman and colleagues, today the Unanimous Consent Calendar was called and among the other bills called were two bills, one H. R. 3377, to increase the rate of pension to World War veterans of World War No. 1 from \$40 to \$50 and \$60 per month. There was one objection made to the consideration of that bill today. Under the present law World War veterans who are now totally disabled to work and follow a gainful occupation are receiving \$40 per month. H. R. 3377 provides they are to have an increase in pension to \$50 per month, and it further provides where such veterans have been rated permanent and total and in receipt of a pension for a continuous period of 10 years or reach the age of 65 years the amount of pension shall be \$60 per month. These are all veterans who served honorably and helped to win World War No. 1.

In order to receive the \$40 per month they must be totally disabled to follow any gainful occupation and in order to receive \$60 per month they must be rated permanent and total and draw a pension for a continuous period of 10 years or must be permanently and totally disabled and have attained the age of 65.

Most of these disabled veterans have families, and under the greatly increased cost of living \$40 per month is grossly inadequate. They must have an increase or they must be the objects of public charity. We cannot afford to permit these men who contributed so much in winning World War No. 1 to become the objects of public charity, and I trust that the House Rules Committee will grant a special rule so that this measure and H. R. 3356 may come up at an early date for consideration.

There was also called H. R. 3356, to provide a small increase in the monthly rates of pension payable to disabled veterans with service-connected disabilities and to widows and children of deceased veterans. This measure would grant a 15-percent increase in pension for these veterans. In order to secure this increase they must have served honorably in World War No. 1 or World War No. 2 and must have received wounds or

other disabilities in the service entitling them to compensation. This measure would also grant a small increase to widows and children of deceased veterans of World Wars No. 1 and No. 2. A widow with no child, \$35; a widow and one child, \$45, with \$5 for each additional child; no widow but one child, \$18; no widow but two children, \$27, equally divided; no widow but three children, \$36, equally divided, with \$4 for each additional child, the total amount to be equally divided.

These are widows and children of veterans of World Wars No. 1 or No. 2, both whose death was due to disability contracted in service in line of duty or who received disabilities in the service in line of duty. These widows and children cannot exist under the high cost of living without some increase of their compensation or pensions, and this is a very modest increase.

Mr. MAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. The gentleman does not understand, does he, that the World War veterans are concerned with this bill at all?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I am referring to the two bills—H. R. 3377 and H. R. 3356—brought up by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN], chairman of the World War Veterans' Committee, which bills were objected to on the floor of the House today. I think those increases ought to be given.

Our distinguished colleague, Mr. DISNEY, a Democrat of Oklahoma, a member of the Ways and Means Committee, according to a press report in a speech in Birmingham, Ala., on October 15, 1943, stated "We are spending money with ravaging insanity." Another distinguished Democrat of the State stated some days ago that the spending of this administration has no parallel in history, and a distinguished Republican Senator recently pointed out that there had been appropriated by the Congress for lend-lease sixty-three billion; eighteen billion given to the President to spend on lend-lease, and an additional forty-five billion dispensed by the Army and Navy in materials and services to other countries, and it now appears that Congress has voted more than three hundred and thirty billion for war purposes. We still have the vicious and indefensible cost-plus contracts. The press carried a story and report a few days ago of one concern having made 3,000 percent in profits on a ship deal with the Government, and a defense plant having made more than 1,760 percent in profits on a single contract, but these enormous sums of money are not going to the defenders of our country and their dependents. If we can give away sixty-three billion to other countries, we should not hesitate to provide for our own defenders, their wives, children, and other dependents, and should not refuse to grant an increase to these disabled defenders and to the widows and orphans of those who have passed on. We shall be discharging our debt of gratitude to them and the

money will remain in our own country. At the same time, it will strengthen the morale of our boys in the service. It will be an inspiration for them to know that this great country will not forget its defenders and their dependents.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield as much time as he may desire to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

WHO WANTS AND ADVOCATES THE SALES TAX AND WHY

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act of 1942, as amended by S. 1279, further increasing allowances and allotments at an estimated cost of approximately \$685,000,000, will increase the total allowances to the wives and children and dependents of the personnel of our armed forces to about \$2,000,000,000. I fully appreciate that this is a large sum of money, but never, during my long service, have I advocated a more meritorious and deserving bill. I feel and all of us should feel that the approximately 3,000,000 men overseas, on the seas, and in the air, instead of being softies, as has often been charged, are the bravest, best trained, and most determined men serving in any of the armed forces of the world today. They are fighting not only for the preservation of our liberty, freedom, and our institutions, but are fighting for humanity so that future generations will not suffer the anguish and horrors of and be obliged to give their lives in another war. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I have no words with which to express my resentment against the financial beneficiaries of this war—the war profiteers—who months ago banded together and through the United States Chamber of Commerce, the National Association of Manufacturers, and other organizations, using certain newspapers, magazines, and other forms of publicity, and through their spokesmen in the House and on its committees, are advocating a 10-percent sales tax which, if enacted, will save them from contributing a small part of their great gains, profits, and reserves toward the payment of allowances and allotments to the wives, children, and dependents of our servicemen.

BIG CORPORATIONS CONDUCT PRESSURE CAMPAIGN TO DEFEAT ANY NATIONAL TAX PROGRAM EXCEPT 10-PERCENT SALES TAX

Mr. Chairman, there is documentary evidence that the big corporations of America decided months ago to conduct a pressure campaign among Representatives and Senators to defeat any national tax program except a 10-percent sales levy. It shows that over 9,000 heads of the biggest corporations of the Nation were asked by the National Association of Manufacturers to bring pressure on all Members of Congress during the recess; that President F. C. Crawford, of the National Association of Manufacturers, addressed these same 9,000 corporation heads August 16, sending each an outline of legislation the association wants passed, including its tax program; that a meeting of the Government Finance Committee and Tax Council,

United States Chamber of Commerce, and other organizations, met in Chicago September 20 under the auspices of the association to outline the tax fight. The resolutions adopted at that meeting called for forced savings, notwithstanding that the large corporations are spending millions for unnecessary newspaper, magazine, radio, and billboard advertising which they can deduct from their income or excess-profits taxes.

Then again on September 24 and 25 the board of directors of the National Association of Manufacturers met in Hot Springs and immediately sent out a confidential memorandum that in general all the big business interests of the Nation have been lined up secretly by the National Association of Manufacturers to use its pressure in Congress to put through its sales tax, rather than accept any other measure which might shift the burden of taxation onto the corporations and require them to pay their share.

Mr. Chairman, I repeat, they are urging and attempting to force the passage of a sales-tax measure so that the moneys needed for servicemen's family allowances and allotments and other moneys needed for the prosecution of the war will be unloaded upon those who are already overtaxed and least able to pay. And please remember that most of these 9,000 corporation heads are receiving salaries ranging from \$50,000 to \$750,000 a year, saying nothing of the bonuses and dividends they receive and profits which they derive from their holdings. Yes; this is the same group that defeated President Roosevelt's recommendations to limit incomes to \$68,000 a year, and they also opposed and defeated the plan for the filing of single or separate income-tax returns which would have netted the Government \$500,000,000. It is the same group which defeated the proposed legislation for the recovery of approximately \$300,000,000 from the mining companies which they had unjustly received for depreciation. Again they joined with financiers and bankers, under the leadership of Ruml, and got away with 75 percent of their income taxes.

I say now, Mr. Chairman, that the action of these approximately 9,100 manufacturers in cooperating with the National Association of Manufacturers and joining with the representatives of organizations acting in behalf of persons of high income and wealth, in advocating a sales tax, is tantamount to a refusal on their part to make a just contribution to share the cost of the war.

Mr. Chairman, the Secretary of the Treasury has made recommendations for the imposition of further taxes in the raising of \$10,000,000,000 and suggested how this sum should be raised, and I feel that it is a fair recommendation. But the gentlemen from Minnesota [Mr. Knutson], who advocates a sales tax, charges that this recommendation would aid the lowest-paid wage earners in being exempted in the paying of the Victory tax. The gentleman from New York [Mr. Taber] and the gentleman from Virginia Mr. Robertson also advocate a sales tax.

May I say, Mr. Chairman, that I actually believe that the advocates of the sales tax cannot in justice urge this tax or lend an ear to the selfish appeal of these avaricious war profiteers.

I have read the statement of the Chairman of the United States Chamber of Commerce which has been advocating this tax monstrosity, and had I been a member of the Committee on Ways and Means before whom he offered his testimony, I would have asked him if it were not a fact that \$42,000,000,000 has been put in reserve by the manufacturers and businessmen of this country in banks and depositories as a reserve for post-war reconversion. I would have further asked if it is not a fact that a large majority of these manufacturers have not already expended tremendous sums of monies in preparation for the reconversion of their plants to produce civilian requirements after the war, and whether such amounts are not being charged to the present cost of production? I would also have asked him whether it is not a fact that nearly all of these 9,100 manufacturers for whom he has spoken have not increased their profits from 50 to 200 percent, exceeding their profits in the banner year of 1929. This increase in profits has taken place notwithstanding the crocodile tears they have shed and their charge that they have been handicapped in their production operations by the Government. Oh, I wonder, if the renegotiation act had not been passed, and they had been left to their own free operation, how much more they would have mulcted from the Government.

Due to their being so grossly absorbed in making more and more money and accumulating greater surpluses, I fear they are not aware of the fact, or are indifferent to it, that we have over 22,000,000 people in our country who are earning less than \$20 a week, and another twelve or thirteen million who are earning from \$20 to \$38 a week. For their information, I quote from an official report issued by the Bureau of Statistics, Department of Labor, which partially sets forth the number of employees in varying wage classifications, with their yearly earnings. It follows:

With wage or salary income, 1939	Present estimated wage or in- come (25 percent)	Total persons
\$100 to \$199.....	\$250	2,920,280
\$200 to \$399.....	475	5,624,980
\$400 to \$599.....	750	4,757,900
\$600 to \$799.....	1,000	4,801,780
\$800 to \$999.....	1,250	3,739,500

Mr. Chairman, repeating from these figures, as will be observed, there are approximately 22,000,000 persons earning less than \$1,000 a year, or \$20 a week. Conceding that the wages and salaries of these low-paid workers have increased 25 percent since 1939, we still would have approximately 20,000,000 people earning less than \$25 a week. To this number must be added the dependents of 9,000,000 soldiers, sailors, marines, Coast Guard men, and members of the auxiliary branches of our armed services. The

allowances and allotments of these dependents are fixed and inflexible. With the ever-increasing cost of living this past year the dependents of those in our armed services find it almost impossible to exist and many wives with children, and aged mothers and fathers, who are more or less incapacitated, have been compelled to obtain employment. I ask, How can this deserving group exist or live half decently if they are compelled to pay a 10-percent sales tax?

Mr. Chairman, others who would suffer great hardship if subjected to a sales tax are the nearly 2,000,000 aged persons on State and public-assistance rolls; 1,000,000 disabled veterans and their dependents; 153,000 retired and disabled firemen, policemen, State and municipal employees; 53,000 blind persons; 700,000 retired workers, widows, and young children receiving social-insurance payments under the old-age and survivor insurance program of the United States Social Security Board; and the more than 400,000 persons who are drawing fixed annuities for which they had put away their savings during many years.

Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the sales-tax advocates are aware that even in the smallest of towns it costs a family of 4 over \$1,200 a year to live. I have here the figures on the cost of living in 33 of our larger cities, and it shows the lowest cost is in Mobile, Ala., which is \$1,424, and for the other 32 cities the range is upward to \$1,758 for San Francisco and New York City, followed by Washington, D. C., Detroit, and Chicago. Of course, Mr. Chairman, the families of the sales-tax advocates are not as large as those of the wage earners, whose families in most instances average 5 or 6, and even 7, and frequently the parents of the husband or wife live with them. I insert the cost-of-living figures for the 33 cities, as follows:

Cost of living for family of 4 in 33 cities of the United States, Dec. 14, 1942

Atlanta, Ga.....	\$1,580
Baltimore, Md.....	1,594
Birmingham, Ala.....	1,542
Boston, Mass.....	1,691
Buffalo, N. Y.....	1,593
Chicago, Ill.....	1,718
Cincinnati, Ohio.....	1,612
Cleveland, Ohio.....	1,690
Denver, Colo.....	1,549
Detroit, Mich.....	1,723
Houston, Tex.....	1,540
Indianapolis, Ind.....	1,554
Jacksonville, Fla.....	1,594
Kansas City, Mo.....	1,506
Los Angeles, Calif.....	1,602
Manchester, N. H.....	1,634
Memphis, Tenn.....	1,593
Milwaukee, Wis.....	1,651
Minneapolis, Minn.....	1,660
Mobile, Ala.....	1,424
New Orleans, La.....	1,543
New York, N. Y.....	1,758
Norfolk, Va.....	1,652
Philadelphia, Pa.....	1,601
Pittsburgh, Pa.....	1,642
Portland, Maine.....	1,636
Portland, Oreg.....	1,641
Richmond, Va.....	1,589
St. Louis, Mo.....	1,655
San Francisco, Calif.....	1,758
Scranton, Pa.....	1,640
Seattle, Wash.....	1,670
Washington, D. C.....	1,757

Mr. Chairman, in connection with the high living costs in the cities, I insert some official figures on food prices which have continuously risen since 1939 and which account for 40 percent of the increased cost of living to the city dweller. They are as follows:

Percent of increase in food prices

Commodity	Quantity	Jan. 1, 1941	Sept. 15, 1942	Today	Percent-ago
Chicken.....	Pound.....	0.21	0.29	0.44	104
Cabbage.....	Pound.....	.02	.03	.05	150
Apples.....	Pound.....	.04	.04	.12	200
Tomatoes (canned).....	Can.....	.04	.05	.10	150
Oranges.....	Dozen.....	.15	.19	.45	200
Butter.....	Pound.....	.30	.49	.56	86
Pork chops.....	Pound.....	.23	.31	.52	120
Eggs.....	Dozen.....	.27	.33	.60	122
Coffee.....	1-pound bag.....	.13	.20	.26	109
Spaghetti.....	Pound.....	.07	.08	.15	114
Tomatoes (fresh).....	Pound.....	.03	.04	.10	233
Beans.....	Pound.....	.05	.09	.11	120
Potatoes.....	Pound.....	.04	.04	.06	50

Mr. Chairman, notwithstanding the increase in the cost of living to the families of wage earners residing in cities, the leaders of most of the farm organizations and many Members of Congress, wishing to demonstrate their influence and interest in the growers of food products, assail and attack the Office of Price Administration and insist that the price ceilings be increased or eliminated and this, despite the fact that the farmers themselves do not seek it. They, themselves, realize and appreciate the fact that today they are receiving from 50 to 300 percent more for their products, and never have been more prosperous in the history of our country. The country banks show tremendous gains in deposits in farmers' savings accounts and this condition applies from one end of the country to the other.

Mr. Chairman, the imposition of a 10-percent sales tax would not affect the farmers to any great degree because with few exceptions they raise nearly everything they need for food. Those items which they are obliged to buy—whether farm machinery, shoes, clothes, and so forth—have increased in cost but 25 percent. If the farm group succeeds in having the price ceilings eliminated, the already exorbitant prices of foodstuffs will go still higher and will tend to bring, as is recognized by all economists, dreaded inflation.

In such event all forced gains and profits will not inure to the farmers' advantage because the value of the dollar which has been protected by the President will surely be reduced and the situation will be akin to what happened in the First World War to the German mark. Consequently, do the farmers not realize that, with the imposition of a sales tax, the greedy and avaricious groups—whether manufacturers or businessmen belonging to the organizations I have mentioned—would escape paying higher income or excess-profits taxes on the biggest incomes and profits they have ever enjoyed in the history of our country, and the sales tax, instead of being beneficial, will be detrimental not

only to the farmers but to the entire Nation, and, especially, to the underpaid wage earners of our cities.

Mr. Chairman, I have received, and I take it other Members have also, appeals from Mr. A. F. Whitney, president of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, from Mr. William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, and from Mr. Philip Murray, president of the Congress of Industrial Organizations, and many others, justly protesting against the imposition of a sales tax. I have called attention to the fact that if such a tax law were enacted the 33,000,000 persons in the United States whose earnings or incomes are less than \$2,000 a year will demand that their earnings be increased in order that they may be able to sustain themselves. In view of that I urge that the Members of this body be not led astray by this coterie of wealthy gentlemen who thus far have sacrificed nothing compared to the sacrifices of our brave fighting men on our far-flung fronts in all parts of the world who are undergoing indescribable hardships and the tortures of hell, or to the toiling and sweating men and women who are giving their all-out efforts in maintaining production schedules in our war plants.

Mr. Chairman, in conclusion I repeat the words of the late distinguished Tom L. Johnson, mayor of Cleveland, Ohio, and a Member of this House, who said:

Let us tax the people on what they have, rather than on what they need.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of the time on this side, approximately 20 minutes, to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT].

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, today we are considering an increase in allotments and benefits to the dependents of men in the armed services of the United States. It is impossible to discuss this question without at the same time considering the drafting of pre-war fathers. These two questions are so intertwined, correlated, and interrelated that it is impossible to consider the one without considering the other. They are not two different questions, but like the two sides of a coin, they are two sides of the same thing, the heads and tails of the whole problem. As I have often said, no pancake is so flat that it does not have two sides. So I am hoping to give full and fair consideration to both sides of this controversial issue. Of course the House has put the cart before the horse. We should consider the drafting of fathers before allotments.

Mr. Chairman, that the manpower problem in the United States is in a miserable mess all will admit, and no one can deny.

Who is responsible for the tragic predicament in which we now find ourselves? The American people? Certainly not. Because the American people instead of being complacent about this war are most conscious of it. They are the ones who are paying the bill, doing the fighting and dying, and in many instances they have been far ahead of

Government officials in Washington. Parents back home, whose sons had daughters are fighting and dying in order to keep our country safe and free, are painfully conscious that we are in a war that is taxing our strength to its limit. The American people today are taking orders and not giving them. It is evident they are not responsible for the present manpower muddle. Never blame the people for what their representatives should do.

Is the Congress responsible for our sorrowful plight? Perhaps to some extent, but not wholly so. Surely Congress cannot be blamed because it has voted this administration practically every power and all the money it has asked for. It has bent over backwards to go along with this administration in order that we might bring this war to a quick and successful close. This is but the wish of the people.

Who, then, is responsible for the present manpower chaos? This administration, with its overlapping bureaus, its duplication of agencies, and the conflicting statements and contradictory orders that they daily give. However much good and intelligent men may differ on the question of drafting pre-war fathers, all will agree that the uncertainty which hangs like a pall over the heads of these fathers should immediately end. They now cannot plan 1 day ahead.

When the War Manpower issues an order today and the Selective Service issues a different order tomorrow, and the next day the Army and Navy ask for something else, the time has come when we must have a unified and centralized manpower control vested with absolute authority and complete responsibility in a single head. We must stop pulling against each other and pull with each other, if we want to take the cheapest and quickest road to victory.

Mr. Chairman, we should be reluctant to criticize at such a time as this; in such a critical hour we should be charitable and tolerant with those who differ from us. The manpower problem covers not only the numerical size of our Army, Navy, and Air Forces, but it must necessarily take into consideration the men and women who work on farms, in forests, mines, mills, and factories to produce the weapons of war and the food and fiber with which to feed and clothe our Army, as well as our civilian population and our allies. The problem is a big, complex, and difficult one, which perhaps can never reach a wholly satisfactory, and certainly not a perfect solution. For this very reason it must have our most earnest, rational, and prayerful consideration.

The successes of our armed forces thus far in air, on land, on sea, and under the sea have proved that the strategy of our Allied command has been sound. It should give us renewed confidence in their leadership. It should make us eternally grateful for their achievements. With all their errors, they have won the first few rounds—but the fight is not yet over. We still have many rounds to go—and it is always the last round that counts.

No civilian, including Members of Congress, should act as an armchair strategist or a parlor tactician in fighting this war. The struggle on the field of battle and in areas of combat must necessarily be left to those experts who have been trained for and who are experienced in the art and science of warfare. Mr. Chairman, this war is as different from the first World War as that war was from the Civil War. We are living in a highly technical and scientific age. Only in those men who have lived and fought in this war should we put our trust. I place my faith in the doctors who are the generals and admirals, who, in spite of all their shortcomings and mistakes, are better prepared than I am to fight this war. They know the score; they are acquainted with the technicalities; they are versed in the problems; by intuition, inclination, training, experience, and knowledge they know this whole problem—modern, complex, and scientific—much better than I know it. I do not want to follow Members of the House, the Senate, the President's staff, the Supreme Court, Wendell Willkie, the Chamber of Commerce, the C. I. O., the National Manufacturers Association, or any other group. The Army, the Navy, and the Air Force are my doctors. Let no one, uneducated, young, and inexperienced, nor old men versed in other realms, dare tell them what to do.

But because of the very wide and complex nature of the over-all manpower problem, the generals and admirals alone cannot win this war. The trained captains of industry supplying the guns, planes, tanks, and ships, the foremen in mines producing the raw ore out of which the implements of war are made, the experienced farmers who know how to farm to produce the food and other by-products of war, are just as essential to the winning of this savage struggle in which we are now engaged.

Marshall and King, MacArthur and Halsey, Arnold and Eisenhower, and all the other gallant commanders should be given, and have been given, the authority and responsibility of conducting this war from the professional militarists' point of view. However, as the President, our Commander in Chief, has clearly and correctly pointed out on various occasions, the home front cannot be divorced from the battle front in this war. It is an all-out effort that requires the full and harmonious cooperation of our entire population. No chain is ever stronger than its weakest link, and the battle front can never be stronger than the home front. Remember, the moral collapse of Germany on the home front in 1918 preceded her military defeat. We are hoping that history will repeat itself.

Members of Congress, as well as others at home, I dare say, are as familiar, if not more so, with the urgent needs of our people on the home front as are any of the admirals or generals. They can learn from us as we can learn from them. We are just as anxious as they are to win this war in the shortest possible time, with the least expenditure of men and money. The problem of manpower is not so much one of procurement as it is

of proper distribution and efficient utilization. On that question Members of Congress can perhaps speak with as full knowledge and with as wise judgment as the military leaders themselves whose energies and efforts are necessarily directed to their particular theater in this war. It is our contention, sir, that if full and efficient utilization were made of our present manpower we would not be forced to draft pre-war fathers.

Mr. Chairman, this afternoon I shall attempt to answer, in all too brief a time and in a very humble way, two most important questions that now confront the American people:

First. Shall we draft pre-Pearl Harbor fathers?

Second. If fathers are to be drafted what will be the compensation of their wives, children, and other dependents?

In spite of all the testimony I have heard, and the hearings that I have read, I am convinced, sir, that pre-war fathers should not be drafted at this time. Perhaps this is not popular, but I would rather be right than popular—and I shall give you the reasons for my position.

At this present hour we have 7,300,000 men in the Army of the United States. More than 2,000,000 of these men are now abroad, approximately the same number we had in the last World War. This leaves more than 5,000,000 men in the Army in continental United States. At least half of these men have been in the Army from 1 to 2 years, and many are growing stale from inactivity. It requires 6 tons of shipping to get one soldier abroad and 2 tons a week to keep him supplied. All the shipping in the world could not transport such an Army. Not more than 2,500,000 could be transported next year. That would leave two and one-half million at home. General Marshall testified before we entered the war that 500,000 were all who were needed to defend continental United States. Today fewer men are needed at home. Why should we induct more men into the armed forces when we already have a surplus of them? Soldiers in trains, in camps, in streets, in our cities could well be used to help on the home front, where we have such a sad shortage of manpower.

Mr. Chairman, I am not holding any brief for the pool-hall loafer, the curbstone warmer, or the ne'er-do-well who shirks his duty, and I naturally wonder, with many others, why so many men inducted are returned home when everyone knows they are capable of doing at least limited service. At this point I want to say that our civilian population should hesitate before criticizing young men of military age who are not in the armed services. Many of them are disabled and have been rejected. Many others are employed on the farm and in war industries that are just as essential as being a soldier. Personally, I feel that these young men are contributing as much to the winning of the war as any man in uniform and should receive some kind of insignia which would designate that they are doing their full share in order that they might escape the stigma, the opprobrium and criticism that might be offered against them by the unthinking public.

They are not trying to hide behind a machine in the factory or a cow on the farm. They are doing their part.

Mr. Chairman, my chief reason for thinking that it is not now necessary to draft pre-war fathers is based upon three careful and thoughtful considerations:

First. The Government has been hoarding manpower. The Costello committee has pointed out that there are thousands of young men, single and eligible for draft, who, in spite of their eligibility are now employed by the Federal Government. Let us weed out these bureaucrats.

Second. Private industry has been hoarding manpower, due to the cost-plus-fixed-fee contract, which Congress long ago condemned, but it has not yet been ended. The bigger the contract, the bigger the fee, and while there was some excuse at the beginning of the program for this sort of contract, it no longer exists. Pools of laborers have been held on when they should have been in uniform and everyone knows it.

Third. The armed forces themselves have hoarded and wasted manpower. There is no excuse today to have pools of officers uncalled, or for lieutenants and captains to have private chauffeurs drive them around Washington and different Army cantonments. Even a Congressman is capable of driving his own car.

Mr. Chairman, I know that in a program so gigantic, moving with such speed as the one that has been thrust upon us, there is bound to be waste, extravagance, and, in some cases, fraud. We have been tolerant, sir, with all of these mistakes because we are human and know that others are human. But the time has arrived when we must say that if all the American people must pay for this war, they at least want their money's worth. This is not selfishness; it is just good business.

Mr. Chairman, while in my own mind I am convinced that the drafting of pre-Pearl Harbor fathers is not now necessary, I want it understood that I shall not disagree with our Chief of Staff. Has General Marshall ever said that he wanted pre-Pearl Harbor fathers drafted? No. Neither he nor any of his associates have ever asked that fathers be drafted. Indeed, they prefer single to married men. And they want them under 30. All that they have demanded is that we have an Army of 7,700,000 men. My contention is if we have a full and efficient utilization of the manpower now in the Government, in the armed forces, in private industry, and our civilian population, we will not need to call fathers. Let us hesitate to break up the homes in America and add to the alarming increase in juvenile crime. The moment you draft fathers, you will pay these men twice as much as you would a single man. But honest dollars in these days are not to be considered.

For myself I want it thoroughly understood that I hold no particular brief for fathers or for any other group of our American citizenry. Indeed, sir, I have seriously questioned in my own mind whether or not the deferment of any particular group is advisable, or the de-

ferment of an individual because he is a member of a particular group. I know that the fathers of this country are as willing or even as anxious to fight as any other citizen. Why? They have wives and children to fight for—more than the single men and they want to do it if they are needed.

In all of my contacts in and outside my district, in my State, and throughout the Nation, they have not asked to be deferred. But if they are drafted, Mr. Speaker, you can put it down that I am going to vote for a most liberal allowance to support their dependents. War is expensive and we all pay for it. I do not like to pay taxes, but if the fathers of this country are drafted, then I shall insist with my voice and my vote that their wives, children, and dependent parents shall receive something above starvation allowances. They will never receive what they justly deserve.

Mr. Chairman, in conclusion I want to say this. We have the best-fed Army in the world, the best-clothed, the best-housed, the best-trained, and the best-equipped. Congress has not acted in a niggardly way. If we pass the House bill as we reported it, it will add \$645,000,000 annually to the pay roll, and that is more money than the Veterans' Bureau is now spending on all the veterans and their dependents of the first World War.

Mr. Chairman, it is painful but it is just. Let us cut down on lend-lease and take care of our own. Charity begins at home. This is not charity but only fair dealing.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. ROLPH].

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Chairman, I approve of this legislation. I shall vote not only for the bill but also for the amendment which the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CLASON] tells us he will offer when the bill is read for amendment.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. STEWART].

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Chairman, this bill was considered very thoroughly before the Committee on Military Affairs. I was not in agreement with the amount of the allotment that was placed in the bill before the committee. The sentiment as to an increase was pretty evenly divided. I am of the same opinion still, that the least we can do would be to make an allotment by the Government to the families of those who are making the fight to preserve our democracy in keeping with the best living standards of America. I am convinced that an allowance of \$50 to the wife, with \$30 for the first child and \$20 for each additional child, is just and not excessive.

As I listened to a witness this morning, speaking of the waste that is going on in this Government and of the kick-backs on renegotiations, I thought that if this Congress stays behind one Lindsay Warren enough will be saved to take care of the families of our patriots.

In reading the Holdenville Daily News yesterday there came to my attention an article about a Martha, Okla., marine

who lost 25 pounds during a 5-day naval battle. This young marine's name is Pvt. Royce Doughty. He saw action in 14 major naval engagements. He appeared before the Altus Rotary Club and said:

There's not a man on the fighting front who wouldn't be glad to come home and work in a war plant or coal mine for three meals a day and a bunk to sleep in.

He further said—

I don't believe any of the war workers would strike or lay off their job for a single day again if they could experience a bombing raid and see men falling dead all around them. But you can't tell anybody what it's like out there. They've just got to go through it themselves to know what we're talking about when we get back home.

We have had occasion to meet several of our soldiers, marines in particular, from the Southwest Pacific. In each case we did not have to ask the question to see what these marines had gone through. It was physically evident upon every occasion.

I shall cast my vote for the Clason amendment for a larger allotment to take care of the families of those in the service and the married men with large families who in all probability are soon to be called to the colors.

Organized labor, big business, and industry are really getting along, but a different condition exists with the armed forces and their families and the farmers and cattlemen of the Nation, and it is indeed a privilege on my part to vote for the amendment to raise the family allotment by the Government of soldiers' families.

There is no comparison in the income of a soldier, marine, or a sailor and that of a defense and public worker than there is in day and night.

The news item appearing in the Holdenville News is as follows:

WOULD BE NO STRIKES IF WORKERS COULD SEE BATTLE, MARINE SAYS

ALTUS, OKLA.—A Martha, Okla., marine lost 25 pounds during a 5-day naval battle in the Pacific, he told the Rotary Club here while home on furlough.

Pvt. Royce Doughty saw action in 14 major naval engagements. The theme of his talk was a plea for labor not to strike during the time of war.

"There's not a man on the fighting front who wouldn't be glad to come home and work in a war plant or coal mine for three meals a day and a bunk to sleep in," said Doughty.

"I don't believe any of the war workers would strike or lay off their job for a single day again if they could experience a bombing raid and see men falling dead all around them. But you can't tell anybody what it's like out there. They've just got to go through it themselves to know what we're talking about when we get back home."

Doughty was aboard an aircraft carrier that was engaged 5 days and nights in a running encounter. There was little time to eat or sleep; he lost 25 pounds in weight.

At one time, the Oklahoma marine didn't see land for 5 months.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER].

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I have heard with interest the remarks of the gallant and distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT], but I must emphatically though reluctantly take is-

sue with him. I believe the question of drafting pre-Pearl Harbor fathers must reside in the realm of military necessity. I cannot possibly gage the logic or the illogic of the drafting of those fathers. That is for the military to decide. We must have faith in General Marshall. He deplores delay in drafting fathers. I cannot question his judgment, his integrity of purpose. But there is something whose logic or illogic I can gage, and that is whether we are going to allow the fathers, pre-Pearl Harbor or otherwise, to be drafted with the fear and trepidation in their hearts that their loved ones will not be properly taken care of. Draft fathers, but concomitantly provide adequately for the wives and children left behind.

I shall vote for this bill because it in a measure does take care of the loved ones of those drafted fathers. I do not, however, believe it goes far enough. It may be that some wives are wealthy and may not be dependent upon the allowances the husbands may or must make to them; but that is neither here nor there. We must treat all the wives and all the husbands alike. That is the democratic way. If some millionaires may profit thereby, that is just too bad.

The tables of the standards of living that appear in the hearings on page 60 indicate the woeful inadequacy of the present allotments to the wives and families of these fathers. There we find the estimated monthly cost of living for a wife and child at maintenance level in 33 large cities as of December 15, 1942. The present allowance of \$62.50 for a wife and child when compared with the monthly budgets indicated on page 60 indeed show the woeful inadequacy of the amounts we allot at the present time. In those cities a wife and child, for example, could not adequately maintain themselves on \$62.50 per month. The minimum requirement in Baltimore is \$79. The minimum requirement in Chicago is \$85.18; in Detroit it is \$85.36; in New York it is \$87.10; in St. Louis it is \$82.05; in San Francisco it is \$87.19. And these figures for minimum subsistence for a wife and child in these cities do not take into consideration illness, accidents, ordinary insurance, education, books, magazines, sales tax, entertainment, bills for dentists, infant, and maternal care.

Some have said that we should only make the allowance where the wife and children are proven dependents, so that the well-to-do would not get the same allowance as those poorer in circumstances. Where should the line be drawn? Administratively, it would be most difficult to draw any line. All must be treated alike—rich and poor, citizen and alien, tall and short, fat and lean. The allotments are really a part of the soldiers' pay and the pay must, in all instances, be alike. Some wives are working and thus unduly benefit, but what of that? That is their privilege. It is the case of the greatest good for the greatest number.

Some have said that we should make different allotments depending upon geography. It is colder and more expensive to live in the North. In the South living standards are lower. Differences

obtain in urban sections. It is cheaper to live in rural sections. It would be utterly inconceivable to set up all these different kinds of standards.

Support for the families should not be mere lip service. It must be at adequate levels.

The Clason amendment which will be offered, I believe, would present adequate levels, and I shall vote for that amendment.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the remainder of the time. I wish to caution the membership again on the question of the expense of this legislation. You have already heard the figures, but it is appropriate that I should at this time repeat that the Senate bill as passed and sent to the House increased the previous allowances of the dependents of our fighting men of all groups and all classifications. The House then considered the measure, and again increased the allowances over that which the Senate had allowed. Then we will be confronted when we come to read the bill under the 5-minute rule with some two or three proposals to again increase the amount, and I shall now call attention to what those increases mean if the amendments that are to be proposed should be adopted. I do not have the figures on the Clason proposal, but I do have them from the Bureau and the War Department on the Sadowski amendment.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. Yes.

Mr. DONDERO. What is the difference between the Senate bill and the House bill?

Mr. MAY. The difference between the Senate bill and the House bill is that the Senate authorizes an increase of \$394,656,000. The House bill proposes an increase of \$659,752,000, or a difference between the two of \$350,952,000.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. MAY. Yes.

Mr. THOMASON. I think the gentleman from Kentucky is mistaken about the figures. I think the figures the gentleman desires are in the Senate bill which came to us the other day, and not the bill amended by the committee.

Mr. MAY. We have not considered the bill passed the other day. This is the original bill. The one passed before the Congress recessed.

Mr. THOMASON. I think the gentleman asked the question about the difference in the cost of the Senate bill, meaning the bill passed the other day as an amendment to the fathers draft bill.

Mr. DONDERO. What I mean is the amount asked for by the Senate bill as compared with the amount in the committee bill reported by the committee of which the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY] is the chairman.

Mr. MAY. The difference is \$350,952,000, and that is the amount that we increased it above the Senate bill, up to \$659,752,000 above existing law. Under the Sadowski proposal, the increase over the Senate bill as originally passed by the Senate will be \$1,301,410,000. In view of the fact that it is already costing the

Government more than a billion dollars, then, if we adopt the Sadowski amendment or the Clason amendment, which is half way between the committee bill and the Sadowski amendment, we will have put on the Government more than two billion of cost each year, and as fathers are inducted, it will gradually increase until after a while we will be paying probably by the end of this year five times what the Government is expending for the Veterans' Administration for all of our World War veterans.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. Yes.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Is it not a fact that the House bill is \$10 a month less for a wife and two children than the Senate bill?

Mr. MAY. It is \$10 less than the proposed Senate bill, which the Senate tacked onto the Bailey-Clark Senate substitute for the Wheeler bill to defer drafting of fathers.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. And they approved of it?

Mr. MAY. The Senate approved of it. We have not taken up that bill yet insofar as it relates to allotments and allowances.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 101 of the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act of 1942 (56 Stat. 381; 37 U. S. C. Supp. 201) is amended by striking out in the first and second lines the words "of the fourth, fifth, sixth, or seventh grades."

Amendment offered by Mr. MICHENER: On page 11, line 5, after the word "amended", strike out the remainder of the section and insert in lieu thereof to read as follows:

"Sec. 101. The dependent or dependents of any enlisted man in the Army of the United States, the United States Navy, the Marine Corps, or the Coast Guard, including any and all retired and reserve components of such services, shall be entitled to receive a monthly family allowance for any period during which such enlisted man is in the active military or naval service of the United States on or after June 1, 1942, during the existence of any war declared by Congress and the 6 months immediately following the termination of any such war."

Sec. 2. That section 102 of such act is amended by changing the period at the end thereof to a comma and adding the words "except as to the initial family allowance provided by section 107 (a) hereof."

Amendment offered by Mr. MICHENER: On page 11, line 7, after the word "amended", strike out the remainder of the section and insert in lieu thereof to read as follows:

"Sec. 102. The monthly family allowance payable under this title to the dependent or dependents of any such enlisted man shall consist of the Government's contribution to such allowance and the reduction in or charge to the pay of such enlisted man, except as to the initial family allowance provided by section 107 (a) hereof."

Sec. 3. That section 103 of such act is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 103. The dependents of any such enlisted man to whom a family allowance is payable under the provisions of this title shall be divided into three classes to be

known as 'class A,' 'class B,' and 'class B-1' dependents. The class A dependents of any such enlisted man shall include any person who is the wife, the child, or the former wife divorced of any such enlisted man. The class B dependents of any such enlisted man shall include any person who is the parent, grandchild, brother, or sister of such enlisted man and who is found by the Secretary of the department concerned to be dependent upon such enlisted man for a substantial portion of his support. The class B-1 dependents of any such enlisted man shall include any person who is the parent, brother, or sister of such enlisted man and who is found by the Secretary of the department concerned to be dependent upon such enlisted man for the chief portion of his support."

Sec. 4. That section 104 of such act is amended by inserting after the words "class B" in the sixth and thirteenth lines, respectively, thereof the words "or class B-1".

Amendment offered by Mr. MICHENER: On page 12, line 5, after the word "amended", strike out the remainder of the section and insert in lieu thereof to read as follows:

"Sec. 104. A monthly family allowance shall be granted and paid by the United States to the class A dependent or dependents of any such enlisted man upon written application to the department concerned made by such enlisted man or made by or on behalf of such dependent or dependents. A monthly family allowance shall be granted and paid by the United States to the class B or class B-1 dependent or dependents of any such enlisted man upon written application to the department concerned made by such enlisted man, or upon written application to the department concerned made by or on behalf of such dependent or dependents in any case in which the Secretary of the department concerned finds that it is impracticable for such enlisted man to request the payment of such allowance. The payment of a monthly family allowance to any class B or class B-1 dependent or dependents of any such enlisted man shall be terminated upon the receipt by the department concerned of a written request by such enlisted man that such allowance be terminated."

"Sec. 105. The amount of the monthly family allowance payable to the dependent or dependents of any such enlisted man shall be—

"To class A dependent or dependents: A wife but no child, \$50; a wife and one child, \$75; a wife and two children, \$95, with an additional \$15 for each additional child; a child but no wife, \$42, with an additional \$15 for each additional child; a wife divorced but no child, \$42; a wife divorced and one child, \$67, with an additional \$15 for each additional child."

"To class B dependent or dependents, payable only while there is no allowance payable to any class B-1 dependent, \$37."

"To class B-1 dependent or dependents: One parent but no brother or sister, \$50; two parents but no brother or sister, \$63; one parent and one brother or sister, \$68, with an additional \$11 for each additional brother or sister; two parents and one brother or sister, \$79, with an additional \$11 for each additional brother or sister; a brother or sister but no parent, \$42, with an additional \$11 for each additional brother or sister."

Mr. CASE (interrupting the reading). Mr. Chairman, I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CASE. Is the Clerk reading the Senate bill or the committee substitute?

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk is reading the committee substitute, and is now on page 11.

Mr. CASE. Under the rule adopted the other day, the original rule stated that

the Senate bill would be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. That rule was amended by an amendment adopted by the House, by which we provided for the consideration of the House committee substitute as an original bill. The question I ask is whether or not any proposal to offer a substitute for the committee bill would have to be offered during the time that this committee substitute is being read, or whether it should be offered at the conclusion of the reading of the entire substitute.

The CHAIRMAN. It could have been offered at the end of the first section, of the substitute, or it may be offered at the end of the reading.

Mr. CASE. So that there is no loss of right in not having offered it?

The CHAIRMAN. No.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 5. That section 105 of such act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 105. The amount of the monthly family allowance payable to the dependent or dependents of any such enlisted man shall be—

"To class A dependent or dependents: A wife but no child, \$50; a wife and one child, \$75; a wife and two children, \$95, with an additional \$15 for each additional child; a child but no wife, \$42, with an additional \$15 for each additional child; a wife divorced but no child, \$42; a wife divorced and one child, \$67, with an additional \$15 for each additional child.

"To class B dependent or dependents, payable only while there is no allowance payable to any class B-1 dependent, \$37.

"To class B-1 dependent or dependents: One parent but no brother or sister, \$50; two parents but no brother or sister, \$68; one parent and one brother or sister, \$68, with an additional \$11 for each additional brother or sister; two parents and one brother or sister, \$79, with an additional \$11 for each additional brother or sister; a brother or sister but no parent, \$42, with an additional \$11 for each additional brother or sister."

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CLASON: On page 12, line 14, strike out the language in lines 14 to 19, including the word "child" in line 19, and insert in place thereof the following language: "\$50; a wife and one child \$80, with an additional \$20 for each additional child; a child but no wife, \$42, with an additional \$20 for each additional child; a wife divorced, but no child, \$42; a wife divorced and 1 child, \$72, with an additional \$20 for each additional child."

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MAY. Was the Clerk reading section 6 at the time the amendment was offered?

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk had just completed the reading of section 5.

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of my amendment is to bring this

bill into exact accord with reference to allowance to dependents of servicemen with the bill as passed by the Senate on October 6. The chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs has referred several times to the bill passed by the Senate. The bill to which he refers is the bill which was passed on July 8, the day we recessed; but since that time another bill on this same subject has passed the Senate. The difference between the bill which passed the Senate on October 6 and the amendment which the committee has offered is something like \$15,000,000 a month. The large sum which the gentleman mentioned of over \$300,000,000 had reference to the difference between the Senate bill of July 8 and the present committee bill. So that in fact when you are speaking of the Senate bill you have to bear in mind that there are two Senate bills. The one to which I refer is the Senate bill which was passed on October 6.

The purpose of offering this amendment is because I feel that the Senate bill, which is the same as my amendment, contains the only provision with regard to allowances which is backed up by any substantial figures.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. CLASON. Surely.

Mr. DONDERO. Why should a divorced wife receive \$42 a month?

Mr. CLASON. If the gentleman will look further in the bill he will find there is a provision which says that a divorced wife receives nothing unless at the time the divorce was granted to her, or at some subsequent time, the court granting the divorce also made an order in her behalf. So that if the divorce decree is silent as to the amount of money she is to receive, she receives nothing.

Mr. DONDERO. Suppose the divorce decree provided that the wife should receive \$25 a month, does she receive \$25 under the court's decree, or does she get \$42 under this bill?

Mr. CLASON. She receives \$25.

Mr. DONDERO. In other words, the court's order would take precedence over this act if we passed it?

Mr. CLASON. I would not say it takes precedence. This act states that she shall receive the amount that was fixed by the court decree.

Mr. DONDERO. I asked that question the other day and I think that was the answer.

Mr. PACE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLASON. I yield.

Mr. PACE. I understand that is not true in the case of a child; that the child would get the payment regardless of the amount fixed by the court's decree. Is the gentleman sure that it is not also true in the case of a wife?

Mr. CLASON. I am sure it is provided in the provisions of this particular act that she is limited to \$42 in the amount that she can receive for herself. She cannot receive anything unless the court order provides that she shall receive something, and then she is limited to the amount fixed in the decree.

Mr. PACE. How about the child?

Mr. CLASON. So far as I know, they are not limited.

Mr. DONDERO. Then the child is not limited to the amount in the court's decree?

Mr. CLASON. That is my understanding.

Mr. CELLER. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. CLASON. I yield.

Mr. CELLER. I notice that the gentleman's amendment contains a very beneficial provision, namely, that as the family increases in number the unit cost per child increases. If I understand the testimony of Mr. Taft, of the Social Security Administration, he pointed that out, whereas the bill offered by the Military Affairs Committee takes the position that there is a descending scale of need as the family increases. Their bill provides \$25 for the first child, \$20 for the second child, and \$15 for the third, whereas your bill provides for each child \$20. It does not militate against what I call the beneficial principle of your amendment, namely, that as the number of children increases the cost per unit increases in accordance with all social-security statistics that I have been able to find.

Mr. CLASON. You are right in the statement that the committee bill provides for a decrease for the children after the second child. In other words, the first child would receive \$25, and in the Senate bill and in my amendment they are given \$30. For the second child the Senate bill and the committee bill and my amendment are in accord at \$20.

Then the Senate bill and my amendment continue the \$20 for each subsequent child, while the committee bill goes to \$15, and in so doing the committee goes directly in the face of testimony given by the Government witness, well qualified to state the facts. This testimony was given by Miss Faith M. Williams, Chief, Cost-of-Living Division, Bureau of Labor Statistics, in presenting figures to show that the wife must have \$64.39 in order to maintain health, just for a maintenance standard of living—not what we call the ordinary American standard of living but just a maintenance standard—and that for each child she had to have, or should have, an additional \$19.56. It makes no difference whether there is 1 child or 2 children or 20 children. This provides only for a maintenance standard of living, and that will cost her just as much to carry on for the 5 children as it will for the first child.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLASON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CELLER. I want to tell the gentleman that I have been connected with welfare agencies for a great many years and we have found inevitably that where the number of children increases the cost of maintenance per unit child always increases and never decreases.

Mr. CLASON. The testimony before the committee certainly showed that it does not decrease.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLASON. I would like to complete my statement, and if I have time left, I will be glad to yield.

The figures on which we are making this request are based upon the figures for 33 cities. Those cities are listed on the back of the printed hearings, which are available to each of you.

The cities are not the 33 largest in the United States; they include some cities in the group of 50,000 to 100,000 in population. Those figures are certainly true for many cities in the United States with less than 50,000 in population; probably they are true for a great many cities all the way down around 15,000 to 20,000 population.

The point that I am making is this: We are, by legislation which is being adopted at the present time—

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. CLASON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. SADOWSKI. I notice that the gentleman has not proposed any amendment to class B-1 dependents. Is it his intention to propose an amendment to increase those allowances?

Mr. CLASON. It is not. My amendment is directed toward the relief of the wife and child or children of the men who go into service.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Thank you.

Mr. CLASON. With reference to the figures, you will find that \$64.39 is for the wife alone, assuming she has no child. Now, the Bureau of Labor Statistics, through its Chief of the Cost of Living Division, Miss Williams, stated that those are the correct figures, but the committee decided and apparently believed, and the Senate also, that a wife without children is likely to work. In the great majority of cases she will be able to get some additional revenue. Therefore, this bill, and my amendment, maintains that figure at exactly the same for the wife, \$50. There is no increase in the cost of this bill under my amendment to the Government for the wife alone. Any increase comes solely for the child or children. With respect to children, the first child would get \$19.56, and that, added to the wife's \$64.39, comes up to \$83.95.

The Senate and I, and others on the committee who are in the same position as I am on this amendment, feel that those two added together, making \$83.95, should be made, in round figures, \$80, and the \$80 is not any more than the wife and child are entitled to. We are told by Miss Williams and by others that that sum probably will allow them to exist on this maintenance schedule, and that for other children the wife must have \$19.56 for each, or else the child cannot continue to have the kind of maintenance support it is entitled to. And it is support of this kind, to provide a monotonous diet, made up of special foods in lists provided by the Labor Department of a sufficient nutritive value, and that is all they are going to get.

I feel certain that the majority of the House will not want to make it impossible for a wife with one child to secure a living even at maintenance level because of

their vote this afternoon. Yet Miss Williams says no cut is possible. The wife will have \$80 for herself and child. She is allocated 20 percent for rent, or \$16. Try to find a decent room with kitchen privileges for two persons in Washington for less than \$4 a week. That is what the wife must do or cut elsewhere. Yesterday's Post carried an advertisement for a Baltimore shipyard seeking employees. It emphasized that it was possible to rent over there a room, kitchen, and bath for \$34 a month. I do not believe we wish to go below \$80 for a wife and child. Their food will consist of a monotonous diet of foods sufficient in nutritional values. Do you want to deprive them of even that standard of living? I do not believe you will. Remember that these are average figures. They will not give even this standard of living in New York, Detroit, Washington, San Francisco, and many other cities. But it is an average figure for the cities of the Nation. People in the rural districts will be somewhat better off, but none of us will envy them whatever slight advantages they may secure by these new figures. They still, in most cases, will be living at lower standards than they would be if the father was back at home working in that Baltimore shipyard. Strangely enough the committee bill is in agreement both with the Senate bill and my amendment in providing \$20 for a second child. The statistics say \$19.56, so it seems that everyone is in line on those figures. But the committee bill then drops to \$15 for each subsequent child, without any reason to support such figures, as if a family is to be penalized if there are more than two children in it. I think, if anything, the mother should be given more than the \$20 allowed by the Senate bill and by my amendment. The child must have \$20 to live on a maintenance diet, which is far below the average American standard of living. In most cases we are demanding of that child that he shall give up both his father and what we would consider a decent standard of living. We are compromising on a lower standard at \$20. I am not ready to injure that child's health while his father is in the Army or Navy over a \$5 bill each month. Nineteen dollars and fifty-six cents is right and you cannot compromise with the right in this case without causing human misery and suffering. I am asking you to support my amendment because it sets the allowances at the Government's own figures; because it already bears the 78-to-1 endorsement of the Senate; and because I know none of you will wish to cause unnecessary suffering to a generation of American children when the amount involved is less than \$15,000,000 per month over the committee bill.

We are helping the people of every United Nation all over the world. Let us be fair to the wives and children of American men at the battle fronts for us.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read the amendment as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SADOWSKI: On page 12, line 13, after the words "a wife, but

no child", strike out the remainder of the paragraph up to and including the end of line 13, and insert:

"\$55; a wife and one child, \$90; a wife and two children, \$120, with an additional \$30 for each additional child.

"A child but no wife, \$42, with an additional \$30 for each additional child.

"A wife divorced, but no child, \$42. A wife divorced and one child, \$77, with an additional \$30 for each additional child."

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that heretofore when these additional requests have been granted, the debate has dragged along until 4 o'clock or after and there was no opportunity for the rest of us to speak, I object.

Mr. SADOWSKI. I hope the gentleman from Michigan will withdraw his objection; there are only two amendments, the Clason amendment and mine. The gentleman from Massachusetts was allowed 10 minutes to speak on his amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] objects.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SADOWSKI] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Chairman, the amendment I have submitted increases the allowances for children up to \$30, for the second, third, and fourth child. It increases allowances for dependent brothers and sisters—and there must be actual dependency, there must be real disability or real dependency—for the B-1 dependents it increases their allotments from \$11 to \$30. The benefits for mothers were increased from \$37 to \$55.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SADOWSKI. Briefly.

Mr. PACE. That portion of the gentleman's amendment was not read.

Mr. SADOWSKI. I sent both amendments to the desk; they pertain to this section. In other words it will read like this: To class A dependents: A wife but no child \$55 instead of \$50; a wife and one child \$90 instead of \$75; a wife and two children \$120 instead of \$95; with an additional \$30 for each additional child.

For a child but no wife \$42 with an additional \$30 for each additional child.

A wife divorced but no child \$42. A wife divorced and one child \$77, with an additional \$30 for each additional child.

Going to class B dependents, that remains the same. The other amendment changes the benefits for class B-1 dependents; and let us realize that these class B-1 dependents must actually be dependents, be crippled or unable to earn their living, or be really dependent on the soldier, not just fake dependents; they must prove by affidavits and otherwise that they are dependent; they must submit their qualifications for dependency.

To class B-1 dependent or dependents: One parent but no brother or sister \$55; two parents but no brother or sister \$90; one parent and one brother or sister \$90, with an additional \$30 for each additional brother or sister; two parents and one brother or sister \$120, with an addi-

tional \$30 for each additional brother or sister. A brother or sister but no parents \$42, with an additional \$30 for each additional brother or sister.

I have in my hand a little clipping I took from one of the papers the other day which states:

Draft deferment and other measures intended to defer agricultural labor put 300,000 more men of military age to work on the farms during the first 6 months of this year than in the same 6 months of 1942, according to reports issued by the Department of Agriculture.

We did a very fine thing when we deferred those agricultural workers. We did that because we knew we had to produce more food and we did not want to rob the farms of workers and thus hamper our food-production program; but do you not see what is going to happen now? Where are these fathers who have dependents and these other men who have dependents coming from? They are coming out of the villages, out of the towns; they are coming out of the cities and not from the farms. A can of beans costs just as much in Podunkville as it does in Detroit; a pair of shoes costs just as much in Podunkville as it does in Detroit; clothes cost the same. About the only saving a man in the small village would have over the large city would be in the matter of rent, for you cannot buy food or clothing for less money in a small town than you can in a large city. When you take away the father, when you take away the breadwinner of the family, they will still have to pay as much for food and clothing as they did before you took him away. The same with a widowed mother, dependent father or brother, and children going to school.

If you take him away and do not make proper provision, it is not right. You cannot take him away and say, "We are going to give your dependent brother or sister only \$11 a month." I had a breakdown here last Thursday. I showed what this meant. It means 6-cent meals for that brother or sister. I showed you the breakdown of that \$15 a month for the other dependent sons or daughters. That is 50 cents a day. We broke that down to 25 cents for food and 25 cents for clothing, shoes, and other necessities. Twenty-five cents a day for food means 8-cent meals for a growing child and it cannot be done even in a little town or a big city like Detroit. It just cannot be done. You cannot buy food for a child on the basis of 25 cents a day. We cannot take away these fathers and leave the family in this condition.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY]?

There was no objection.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Chairman, I enjoyed the remarks of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT], who hit the nail on the head when he said that none of us wanted to draft the fathers, none of us intended to take these men away

from their families and break down the family life of America. I do not believe there is a Member in this House who actually would want to take and draft the pre-Pearl Harbor fathers or these boys who actually have dependent mothers or dependent brothers and sisters. It was not our intention to do that; we did not want to do it, but we are forced into this business because of the demands of the Army. The Army made the request and the Congress is being put in the position where it has to do something that it did not intend to do originally.

If we are going to take these fathers away from their families and not make provision to keep up the morale of their families at home by giving adequate allowances, we are not going to have good soldiers. We are not going to have a good Army. It only takes two or three men who are dissatisfied and disgruntled and who feel an injury has been done to them and to their families to spoil the morale of the whole outfit. You men who have been in the service know that. You also know how fast that discontent will spread.

I think the duty is plainly ours to take care of these dependents if we take away the fathers from their homes and their families. I for one do not want to indulge in the experiment of making the allowances submitted under the committee bill. For years we have allowed an exemption in our income tax laws for dependents. We started out originally with a \$500 allowance as an exemption for a dependent child or some other dependent, then we reduced that to \$400, and in the last tax bill we cut it down to \$350. In other words, if you have a son or a child who is dependent upon you, you are allowed \$350 exemption in your tax bill. That being so, it means that we have figured it out at \$30 a month approximately as the right figure to allow for a dependent son or daughter or a dependent brother or sister or any dependent you may have. This Congress has figured out, the Treasury Department has figured out, that it takes about \$30 a month to keep each dependent. Is it fair then to take a father away and say, "We made a mistake when we figured our exemption under the income-tax laws. When we figured that it would cost \$30 per month to take care of a dependent, we made a mistake. We think now that you can do it on \$15." With all the increases we have had in food costs and clothing costs, it just does not make good sense. You cannot send a man out to fight for you and the country and tell him, "You go and take care of your family for one-half of the amount that we have established for years as a reasonable allowance."

Mr. Chairman, that concludes my remarks unless there are some questions.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I pride myself on the fact that shortly after the Seventy-eighth Congress met I introduced a bill doubling allotments for dependent children of servicemen. I believe that the

Clason amendment provides substantially what the Hall bill provides in that it doubles the allotment for dependent children. I am going to support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts, because I feel sure that this House must pass this amendment if we are going to draft fathers from the families of America.

May I say further that I could not vote to draft the heads of families unless as a Member of this House I had done everything I could to provide a substantial stipend for those children and for those dependent wives these men must leave behind. We must provide money for the food and clothing which those dependents need. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I sincerely hope that the House will be able to muster up enough votes to approve the Clason amendment so that the men in the service will have even greater morale than they have under the present situation. A man who has a wife and children back home can fight a hundred times harder for the cause he is espousing if he knows in his own heart that his loved ones are being taken care of while he is away at the fighting front giving everything he has for the greatest Nation in the world.

Mr. DONDERO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. I think the gentleman made a mistake when he said that Clason amendment doubled the amount for the children. It adds only \$5.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. The gentleman will find that the Clason amendment doubles the allowance for the second and succeeding children and that is what the Hall bill, which he will find if he investigates was the first of its kind to be introduced, makes provision for.

Mr. DONDERO. It only adds \$5 for the class A dependents. It is raised from \$15 to \$20 a month.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. The gentleman will find that for the second and succeeding children the amount is doubled under the Clason amendment, and, for that reason and on the basis of the figures which have been presented by the gentleman from Massachusetts and others, it is absolutely necessary that we appropriate at least \$20 a month for each succeeding child.

Mr. CASE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. The gentleman means, I believe, that the Clason amendment doubles the allotment for the succeeding children as compared with the present law.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. That is right.

Mr. CASE. Not as compared with the committee bill.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. That is true.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the Members of the House will be solidly behind this proposal to increase the allotments as outlined in the Clason amendment, because a wife and child left behind, with their

husband as a serviceman gone to the front, cannot expect to make their way without sustenance, and we should increase these allotments that have been proposed in the committee bill. If we do not do that, we are going to see the wives and families of servicemen have a great deal of trouble economically, and the wives are not going to be able to support their children otherwise. I would like to see any one attempt to raise a family on the amount of money which has been provided previously with the father away. I would like to see any wife or mother support her children without additional sustenance. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I hope the Clason amendment will be agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, may I ask the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs why the committee bill discriminates against the second child in case the second child happens to be a semi-orphan and his mother is either dead or divorced?

Mr. MAY. I do not understand that there is any discrimination against the second child.

Mr. CASE. There very definitely is. The language of the committee substitute provides for a wife and one child, \$75, or a wife and two children, \$95, thus providing \$20 for the second child; but it provides in the succeeding lines that a child but no wife shall be allowed \$42, with an additional \$15 for each additional child.

Thus, the second child if motherless gets only \$15 against \$20 if the mother is living. Further, a wife divorced with no child gets \$42, and with one child gets \$67, which is the same \$25 allotted for the first child when the mother is living and not divorced, but the bill then provides an additional \$15 for each additional child. So that the second child of a divorced mother gets only \$15 as against \$20 for the second child if the mother is not divorced.

That certainly is discriminatory. If the mother of a second child is living and is married to the husband that second child is allowed \$20, but if the mother of the child is dead and he is a second child, or if the mother of the child is divorced and he is a second child, he is allowed only \$15. There is no justification for such a discrimination.

The facts are that if the second child is unfortunate enough either to have his mother dead or divorced he may need that extra \$5 much more than the child whose mother is living.

I want to point out that in addition to that discrimination and that flaw in the committee's bill as presented, if you correct it and provide the same \$20 for the half-orphan second child or the second child of divorced parents that you propose for the second child in an unbroken home, then you have provided the \$20 that is proposed by the Clason amendment. I think it is fair to assume that most of the supposed additional cost for the Clason amendment would be found primarily attributable to second children.

So, if you correct the committee bill to provide \$20 for the second child, in the case of a divorced couple or in the case where the mother is dead, then you have pretty nearly adopted the Clason amendment. The sensible thing it seems to me is to adopt the Clason amendment, in the first place, and give the second child \$20, regardless of whether his mother is dead or divorced or whether she is living.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. COSTELLO. I may state to the gentleman that where the mother is living the committee allows only \$25 for the first child and \$20 for the second and \$15 for each additional child, but where the mother is deceased the committee allows, instead of \$25, \$42 to that first child and then \$15 and subsequently; so the committee has not discriminated against the second child. Instead, the committee has allowed an enlarged amount for the first child in view of the fact that there is no mother, namely, increasing the amount from \$25 to \$42, and adding \$15 for the additional child.

Mr. CASE. No; the larger allowance for the first child in case the mother is either dead or divorced is in recognition of the fact that if the mother were living and receiving \$50 part of that \$50 would provide the home and pay the rent for the children.

Mr. COSTELLO. That is quite right. For that reason we felt it was not necessary to increase the amount for the second child to \$20, but left it the same as it would be for all additional children.

Mr. CASE. If that were so, why do you give the second child of the living and undivorced mother the additional \$5? The effect of the language of the committee substitute plainly is to provide \$20 for the second child if the mother is living and only \$15 if the mother is either dead or divorced.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. SADOWSKI. My amendment will take care of those discrepancies and unfair conditions.

Mr. CASE. Yes; I think that is so, as far as the point is concerned which I have raised.

Mr. SADOWSKI. My amendment provides for \$30 to each child, regardless of whether he is the first, second, or third.

Mr. CASE. I believe the gentleman's amendment does not have that discrimination against the second child who is motherless or the child of a broken home. Certainly the Clason amendment does not have that discrimination. All children after the first, regardless of their mother's status, are treated alike and are given the amount which the committee itself proposed for the second child in an unbroken home. Therefore, I think the Clason amendment should be adopted.

Mr. DIMOND. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, this bill illustrates the difficulty of legislating equitably and fairly for all the people of the United States. We have before us three proposals—one embraced in the bill which was reported by the committee, another in the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CLASON] and a third proposed by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SADOWSKI].

Even if the Sadowski amendment should be adopted, the result will mean hardship, misery, cold, and near starvation to the wives and children of men in Alaska who are married and who are drawn into the Army. A wife without children can secure employment and thus support herself in whole or in part. But a wife with children cannot possibly live in Alaska on the allotments provided.

On the last page of the printed record of the hearings on the bill appears a list of 33 cities of the United States, giving the cost of living in the various cities for a family of 4. Washington, D. C., is the base, rated at 100. We find by looking at this table that the only one above the base is New York, which is listed at 100.4. San Francisco comes near to it because it is listed at 99.9.

If we should list any part of Alaska here—I do not care where it is—it would be far above that base. The rating of Alaska in the southeastern part of the Territory would be at least 150 and the rating in the northern part in the vicinity of Fairbanks, which, as has been pointed out, is even now and will be in the future an important aeronautical center, would be at least 200. So no matter what the result is as to which one of these amendments is adopted, the wives and children of the men in Alaska who are drafted into military service will inevitably suffer unless they have private means with which to maintain themselves. They just cannot live on the money provided in any of these proposals.

Therefore, in order to get the best I can to help my own people, who are citizens of the United States just the same as are the people who live in the districts of the various Members, I hope and pray that the Sadowski amendment at least will be adopted, because that will give the most.

Even under the Sadowski amendment, Mr. Chairman, I suggest that we are not being generous; we are not being even just to some of our citizens. But I understand that in a bill of this kind—since I am a member of the committee, by grace of the committee—it is very difficult, and the committee thought it impossible, to adopt the formula which has been adopted by the civilian agencies of the Government; that is, paying to the civilian employees of the Government who reside in the Territory of Alaska and who work in Alaska 25 percent more than is paid to similar employees who reside in the main body of the United States. At the present time, Mr. Chairman, nearly all the Federal departments and agencies operating in Alaska, with the notable exception of the Post Office Department, the employees of which always seem to receive the least

pay, while faithfully rendering the best possible service, are paid 25 percent more in compensation than they would be if they were serving in the States. That differential is completely justified, and, indeed, it has been found necessary to secure competent employees for work in Alaska. But the committee, for reasons deemed controlling, has decided that with respect to the allotments and allowances for wives and children of men in military service no such differential can be recommended. Therefore, we are compelled to ask for allowances sufficiently high to take care of wives and children, particularly the children, of servicemen in every part of the country. Surely it would not be becoming to have the children of men in military service face starvation in Alaska for lack of adequate food or face freezing for lack of adequate fuel because the same amount of money which is provided by the Government for their support would be adequate to keep them in food and fuel and the other necessary supplies in Alabama or Illinois or Kansas or California or some other part of the Nation. If a soldier drafted in Alaska learns that his children are not receiving enough to eat or wear or sufficient fuel to keep them warm he will not be consoled by being told that if they were living somewhere else in the United States they could live comfortably on the allotment and allowance granted.

It is impossible to equalize living conditions all over the country. Sharp differences are bound to exist between urban and rural areas, and, in fact, the information given at the hearings, on which the committee presumably acted, is largely based upon experience in the 33 cities listed on page 180 of the printed record of the hearings, cities in which the cost of living is from 33 to 100 percent lower than in Alaska.

May I invite attention to the testimony of Miss Faith M. Williams, Chief of the Cost of Living Division, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Department of Labor, Washington, D. C., commencing on page 157 of the hearings. Miss Williams asserts that very little economy can be expected for each additional child as the number of children is increased. She has further pointed out that with a husband and wife only the expenditure per person for food is 16.7 cents per person per meal, but where there is a family with husband, wife and three or four children the expenditure for food is reduced to 9.4 cents per person per meal. As I understand her testimony, however, there is no substantial reduction in the cost of food or other necessary supplies as to the addition of children so that cost of living of the second child will be as much as the first and the third as much as the second, and so on.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SADOWSKI] in his speech of last Thursday, presented an illuminating budget for the support of a wife and two children amounting in all to \$120 per month. This appears on page 8354 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of October 14. It will be noted that his estimate of the cost of meals is 17 cents per meal. Nowhere in Alaska can a nutritive meal be had for 17 cents and yet it is evidently

contemplated that the child of a serviceman in Alaska is somehow expected to live on a meal costing something less than 10 cents. This is one of the things that just cannot be done. And so, in passing this bill, as reported by the committee, or as suggested by the Clason amendment, the wives and children of servicemen in Alaska will be unable to obtain the bare necessities of life from the allotments and allowances provided by legislation, and they must depend for part of their support upon private funds or upon local relief organizations or upon charity.

All Members of this body unquestionably wish to provide for our soldiers all that they would provide for themselves. So far as those in service are concerned this purpose has been amply fulfilled. The food and clothing provided for those in military service is just as good as that of the ordinary Member of the House of Representatives. That purpose, in justice to men in military service, should be carried further, and the children of men in service should be furnished with just as good food and clothing, in substance, as we provide for ourselves. And now it is scarcely necessary to say that we ourselves are not attempting to live on meals that cost 9.4 cents per meal or on meals that cost 16.7 or 17 cents per meal.

The Sadowski amendment would provide for a wife \$55 per month. Candidly, I do not know of any reason why the \$50 per month provided by the committee bill and by the Clason amendment should be expanded to \$55 per month. After all, a wife in good health and without children can secure employment. But with the advent of children, the case is different for the children must receive care and ordinarily only the wife can provide that care. And so, the \$90 per month for a wife and one child, as suggested in the Sadowski amendment, is certainly not too high. The Sadowski amendment provides an additional \$30 per month for each additional child which, again, in my judgment, is probably the bare minimum required to support a child even in the large cities of the United States, and insufficient for the child's support in the Territory of Alaska.

Our problem would be solved, of course, if the House would entertain an amendment whereby those in Alaska and in other parts of the country where the cost of living is high would receive more than is paid in parts of the country where the cost of living is low, but I understand that no such formula can possibly be adopted. Therefore, I urge upon Members their sympathetic consideration of the Sadowski amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alaska has expired.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time for debate on both the amendment and the substitute be limited to 30 minutes additional. Apparently there is not much disposition to debate the matter.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the right to object. That covers what?

Mr. MAY. Both the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CLASON] and the substitute to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SADOWSKI].

Mr. MICHENER. And does not cover other amendments to this section?

Mr. MAY. Oh, no.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Chairman, I am very sorry indeed to have to differ with some of my colleagues on the Military Affairs Committee with regard to this vital legislation. The distinguished and very able gentleman from Kentucky, for whom I have great respect and affection, and his capable subcommittee, headed by my brilliant friend from Alabama, have worked long and conscientiously to report to this House a measure which they deem embodies adequate allowances for the dependents of our servicemen. However, I am unable to bring myself to the view that the allowances provided for are sufficient, in fact the only evidence presented before the committee indicates clearly that they are insufficient. Moreover, the rates provided in this measure as reported are substantially below those contained in the Senate bill. In my opinion Congress should constantly keep in mind in considering this legislation the fact that our enlisted men and their families are not privileged at this time to participate in the very high wages being paid generally in war industry. We should constantly be mindful of the great disparity between the pay of enlisted men and workers in war industry, because certainly no one could challenge the statement that these boys and their families have been denied the privilege of participating in the very real benefits of high wartime wages.

Further, I am unable to render my support to this measure on asserted grounds of economy. I am for economy. I am for economy as strongly as any man in this House. I am for eliminating every nonessential governmental activity, every unimportant, duplicating bureau and agency in the Federal Government, of which there are legion. But I am not persuaded that we ought as a Nation to lay down the policy of instituting economy at the expense of the wives and babies of the boys who are serving their country on the global battle fronts, on the high seas and in the air, and who are offering their very lives, if need be, on the altar of American patriotism. There are many other ways available to us of saving money and reducing governmental expenditures that are not at the expense of these already distressed groups who have to worry constantly about the safety and ultimate fate of their beloved husbands and fathers.

If we are sincere about our desire for economy we can reduce the cost of government, as I believe the Congress is disposed to do. We can eliminate unnecessary and meddlesome bureaus. We can tackle and curtail the grandiose programs of world-wide relief, world-wide reform, and the bestowal of world-wide

largesse which have cost and are costing us unmeasured, unimaginable, and undisclosed billions, as well as depriving our people needlessly and indiscriminately of many of the necessities of life. The last thing I am willing to do as a Member of this body is to be niggardly and penurious with the wives and children of our heroic servicemen, who, next to our war heroes themselves, have first claim upon our solicitude.

I readily admit that increased allowances I propose to support may develop some problems because of the difference in standards of living in various places throughout the country. In some cases these increased allowances may seem and be more than required for particular communities—I will not dispute that. But, if Congress is to err in this matter, I prefer it should err on the side of giving too much rather than too little to the families and children of those who are sacrificing their careers and their lives to win this war and preserve our own democratic institutions. We cannot in justice adapt these allowances to our lowest standards. We must be liberal and generous beyond any question.

There is additional reason for my support of the higher rates. To keep the American family from disintegration while husbands and fathers are in the fighting services is certainly not the least of our objectives in this legislation. The allowances proposed by the amendment of the gentleman from Michigan, which I am disposed to support, will enable the wives of servicemen to be free to provide care and supervision of their young children and thus keep families together under proper parental controls while fathers are in the service of our country.

For the most part the higher allowances which I am urging will relieve the necessity of any wife of an enlisted man leaving her family to supplement the family income by working in outside employment, whether this work is in defense plants or elsewhere. The increases I advocate are consistent with evidence furnished the Military Affairs Committee by statistical experts of the United States Department of Labor as being necessary and essential to minimum, healthful, comfortable, and decent standards of living and are the very least we should, in my opinion, to provide for the dear ones of our global heroes.

We have heard much talk about the gratitude and appreciation our people feel because of the sacrifices and matchless contributions of our boys and because of the great unpayable debt which we of the Nation owe them. Let no Member of this body, let no American, have any doubt about that debt.

On every hand we hear the phrase, "Nothing is too good for them." Let this Congress practically demonstrate some living, actual, and tangible evidence of this oft-expressed sentiment of gratitude and appreciation, which surely is shared by all of us, by voting in a true spirit of generosity, justice, and patriotism for genuinely adequate and liberal allowances.

If this Congress can authorize more than \$1,000,000,000 a month—and we do

not know accurately how much more it is—for bounties, gratuities, subsidies, and gifts to foreign peoples, it can provide at least \$1,000,000,000 a year to nourish, care for, and maintain and support at decent American standards of living, the wives and children of the gallant boys who are fighting to save the country.

Mr. STEARNS of New Hampshire. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last clause.

Mr. Chairman, there is no difference of opinion in this House or in the country as to the principle of dependency allowances for the families of the men in the armed forces. Furthermore, there is no difference of opinion on the fact that after nearly 2 years of war, after a period of definite increase in the cost of living after experience with the legislation now on the books, the time has come for a revision of that legislation.

This whole subject matter has been a matter of careful study by a Senate committee, and that body, on October 6, passed a bill which is now before us with certain amendments from the Military Affairs Committee. In that bill figures were given for dependents, and particularly the allowances for children, which have been justified on this floor today, as based on sound estimates as to minimum cost of living.

I believe there is no difference of opinion as to the structure of the new bill. It has the approval of the War and Navy Departments, as to structure and procedure. The only difference between the two Houses in this matter is in the amount to be paid to dependent children.

I believe the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CLASON] has justified the figures he has offered, and I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

I am just as strongly in favor of economy as any Member of this House. I think we are in danger of going on the rocks if we do not find some way, even in time of war, to cut down Government expenditures. All of my interest, all of my support, is given to any measures tending to that end. But there is such a thing as false economy. In justice to the men who are serving in all quarters of the globe, we cannot do less than see that their morale is sustained by such allowances to their dependents as will relieve them, as far as possible, from anxiety when they are serving us on all battlefronts.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Hampshire has expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the chairman of the committee a question. Does a wife who has been divorced because of infidelity receive compensation just the same?

Mr. MAY. If it is covered by court decree; but otherwise she would receive it just the same.

Mr. HOFFMAN. If justice were done, of course, we would pay the soldiers compensation at least equal to that received by industrial workers—men in the factories. Even that would not put them on an equal footing with those of us who

remain at home. That seems to be impossible, and it is doubtful whether or not we will be able to pay dependents of the soldiers the sum provided for in this legislation; certainly, we cannot make adequate payment to them for the service and sacrifice made.

I intend to support the bill the Committee sends back to the House. The men who are doing the fighting deserve all that we can give, and I shall on all occasions vote to protect and aid them and their dependents.

Mr. Chairman, let me now for a moment turn again to this question of doing something for the men who are in the armed service by way of getting to them the implements of war which they must have. Let us learn who is responsible for the lack of production at some of the plants here at home.

BOMBERS AND FIGHTERS FOR THE FIGHTING MEN
OR VOTES FOR A FOURTH TERM?

Repeatedly, the President has called upon the citizens to wholeheartedly and with a singleness of purpose back him in the prosecution of the war.

Almost without exception, industrial workers, in unions and out; farmers; businessmen; industrial leaders—in fact, everyone—responded to that call, but there is a growing doubt as to whether the President himself and certain politicians who surround him are willing to forget everything but the war and devote themselves wholeheartedly to the single purpose of the winning of that war.

That may seem like a harsh statement, but consider the following facts, which give reason to that doubt and to the suspicion that the garnering of votes is interfering with the production of planes.

FACT NO. 1

The Government has furnished or advanced \$64,000,000 to the Brewster Aeronautical Corporation, which was set up to manufacture aircraft for the fighting forces. It was engaged in the production of bombers. More recently, it was switched to the production of Corsair fighters.

FACT NO. 2

Because of a labor dispute the plant was taken over by the Navy, and, since that time, by direction of the Navy, the management has been changed; I think it was eight times.

During that period a union contract has been in existence and, while different managements have been one party to the contract, the union has been the same and labor disputes and strikes have continued.

This leads directly to the thought that if one management and a union could not agree there was a 50-50 chance that management was wrong. When, however, the same union finds it impossible to work harmoniously with any one of several—in this instance eight different managements, if I am correct—there is a growing doubt as to the soundness of the union's position.

It is improbable that each of eight separate and distinct managements was arbitrary, unreasonable, and opposed to giving labor a fair deal, especially as the management could pass on the cost of

any reduction of hours of employment, of increased pay, to the Government itself.

Put it in another way: None of these managements had anything to gain by quarreling with the union, by creating a situation which would cause a slow-down, a walkout, or a strike.

FACT NO. 3

According to the testimony of Under Secretary of the Navy Forrestal, the testimony of Assistant Secretary of the Navy Bard and of other officers of the Navy who have testified, the cost of production at Brewster has been excessively high, the management was weak, and there has been labor trouble.

FACT NO. 4

Inasmuch as the Navy has had supervision of managements; has frequently changed management; as the management is a management of its own selection, the Navy itself is directly responsible for the weakness of the management; or, if it is mistaken in its conclusion that the management has been weak, the Navy is to blame for the labor trouble, either because the management it installed has provoked that trouble or because the Navy itself has failed to deal adequately with those in the union responsible for the slow-downs and the strikes.

FACT NO. 5

The record will show, and the War Labor Board must have that record, that the officers of the Navy who are in direct charge have time and again called the attention of the Department to the situation, to the causes of the labor disputes.

The record will show that the fault lies not with the officers of the Navy who are in charge locally at the Brewster plants, but that it lies with the so-called higher-ups.

Proof of this charge is found in the testimony of Assistant Secretary Bard, who referred to the reinstatement of four guards who had disobeyed orders given by Navy officials; who were court-martialed and sentenced, had those sentences set aside and other jobs given them.

Pressed by a committee member, Bard admitted that he personally did not approve of the rehiring of the four disobedient guards. It is evident that, officially and undoubtedly because coerced, he did approve of it or at least did not officially protest.

Testifying before the subcommittee of the House Naval Affairs Committee, Bard sought to excuse the guards by the statement that, in his opinion, they had not been properly indoctrinated. But the record will show, as will the investigation by the F. B. I., that the guards were advised of their duty, that they took the oath of office, and that, in union meetings both before and after the strike of August 23, by a fellow member, their attention was called to the fact that they were obligated to obey the orders of the Navy, that they owed a duty to the Government, that their oath required them to obey the orders issued by the Navy officers on the ground at the plant.

Bard failed to mention that, no matter what indoctrination—whatever that

may mean—was given to the guards, under the contract with the union, neither the management nor the Navy can discipline or discharge a guard who belongs to the union. The only exception is where the guard violates a Navy order. But when the guards did violate Navy orders and an attempt was made to discipline them, some politician in the Navy revoked the order punishing the guards for disobedience.

FACT NO. 6

The testimony of Assistant Secretary of the Navy Bard, of Forrestal, and of others so far heard by the subcommittee, discloses that, as a business proposition, Brewster is not sound.

It further appears that the only reason for continuing the Government's contract with Brewster for the production of fighting planes is the vital need of the Navy for those planes and its inability to get them elsewhere.

The lives of many of MacArthur's men can be saved, the war can be shortened, the return of the boys to their homes can be hastened if MacArthur and the Navy in the South Pacific can get the Corsair planes without delay and in sufficient number. It is up to Brewster to turn them out.

Some 21,000 workers, women and men, are employed there, and not 10 percent of them wish to slow down production. The overwhelming majority are disgusted, their feelings of patriotism outraged, by the delaying, obstructive tactics of a small minority which to date has slowed down production, called or caused strikes.

FACT NO. 7

The Navy knows who caused and who called the strikes. The one of June 24 was called by the officials of the local union. The one of August 23 was a union strike. The Smith-Connally law, forbidding strikes except on a 30-day notice, has been violated. The F. B. I. has investigated, and the facts have been before the W. L. B. and the Navy has them.

FACT NO. 8

(a) The Navy has under its charge a plant capable of producing Corsair fighters.

(b) The employees, some 21,000 of them, are ready and desire to work to produce those planes.

(c) Strikes have been called by the local union in violation of the Smith-Connally law and there have been slow-downs which hindered the production of planes.

(d) The management has sought to discipline those responsible for slow-downs and for strikes, but was prevented from doing so by the Navy and the union.

(e) The local Navy officers imposed sentences upon some of those responsible for slow-downs and strikes. Someone in the Navy higher up, and evidently it is not Bard or Forrestal, overruled the desire of both management and the Navy to discipline those who were sabotaging the production of these fighters needed by the armed forces.

The foregoing are facts and they lead to just one outer door, and that is the office of Secretary of the Navy Knox. Knox is a politician.

Naturally then comes this query: Is it Knox, Secretary of the Navy, who so far has supported the saboteurs in the Brewster Aeronautical Corporation in their efforts to prevent production; who has overruled Navy officials under him who imposed sentences upon the guards who disobeyed the Navy's orders, violated their oath to support the Constitution and the Government? If it is not Knox, who is it?

Is it Knox who is responsible for the reemployment of those four guards who would not have been reemployed had Bard been permitted to follow his judgment?

Is it Knox? Or is it the candidate for a fourth term who today is responsible for nonproduction of needed war equipment at the Brewster Aeronautical Corporation plant?

Certainly someone is responsible, and it is time that the responsibility be fixed.

The engineers, the production men in the Navy at the Brewster Aeronautical Corporation can get, and long ago they would have had, production, had not their hands been tied.

It is the old, old problem, which has existed in so many wars. It was with us in the Civil War. It is here again today. It is the situation all too familiar, all too dangerous, all too costly, where men on the fighting front, willing to do their whole duty, willing to give their lives if necessary; where those who are behind them at home, find their efforts hindered by someone higher up who cannot or who will not devote his whole thought to the defeat of the enemy because his attention is distracted by some political issue.

The C. I. O., to which the union which has caused these strikes owes allegiance, has promised to support the President in his quest for a fourth term.

Is it merely a coincidence that, throughout this land of ours, since the enactment of the Smith-Connally Act prohibiting strikes without a 30-day notice, an act which the President vetoed and which, by a two-thirds majority of both Houses, was repassed over his veto, strike after strike has gone unpunished?

In San Francisco, carload after carload of supplies destined for shipment to the South Seas fighting forces; in the South, truckload after truckload of war supplies, were held up by strikes. No one was punished.

The miners are again on strike and the Government has failed to act, although there has been ample time for an investigation to determine whether they were fairly and adequately paid when the cost of living and other wages were taken into consideration.

Is the President refusing to permit the law-enforcing agencies of the Government to breathe life into the Smith-Connally Act, which he vetoed, but which is the law of the land and which, under his oath of office, he is bound to vitalize?

We were told long, long ago, that no man can serve two masters. In the hearings before the Naval Subcommittee it has been made to appear that the loyal, patriotic workers who want to render a full day's service in support of

those they have sent to the war, have three masters—the Navy, the management, and certain union officials. In time of war, they should have but one, and that one is the Navy. And I predict that the Navy they would gladly serve, if given the opportunity and protection in that service.

Secretary Knox should forget politics and so should the President and one or the other should see to it, without further delay, that this great plant and its thousands of employees who desire to work, and who are capable of rendering aid which would shorten the war, make it less bloody, are put into full production.

Is Secretary of the Navy Knox, is the administration, interested in getting fighting aircraft for the Navy which needs them; or is it more interested in getting votes for a fourth term?

What happened at Brewster will give the answer.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, I want to mention one point that I do not think has been touched on today, and which I mentioned the other day. That is, in trying to arrive at fair compensation for the wives and children of the servicemen we ought to consider whether or not what we propose to allow is discriminatory; whether or not they get disproportionately less than other segments of the population are receiving who are in the war effort also. That is exactly what I think the bill which the committee has brought out does. It is too low considering what other parts of our population are receiving.

On page 179 of the hearings is shown a list of the cost of living in 33 American cities. This list comprises the big cities, and it shows that the lowest cost of living in those cities for a family of four, under the Works Progress Administration's yardstick, is \$1,541.

It runs up to \$1,807 in San Francisco and is the same for those who are living in my particular area, which includes Vallejo, Sacramento, and Stockton, Calif. Look at the situation that confronts these people whose husbands are away from home some place in the war. A wife and one child under the committee bill will get \$900 a year from the United States Government; a wife with two children gets \$1,140 a year; a wife with three children gets \$1,320 a year, and so forth. Under the Clason amendment they will get \$960, \$1,200, and \$1,440 a year, and for additional children \$240 a year more for each child.

Right across the street from the family of this serviceman is some man who is about 38 years of age or younger who has been deferred and is working in a war industry or is working in agriculture. I have no objection to the deferment principle; I think that is the only way we can get workers to man the various skilled tasks that have to do with the war. But when under the same law you make the selection of one man for a war industry and you make a selection of another for agriculture and right over

here another man is selected for the Army, I think that it is only good grace for us to pay the women and the children of the men who are selected for the Army a little more than the bill that the committee has presented gives them. That is, when you consider the cost of living.

The amount provided under the Clason amendment is the very minimum that they ought to receive. Even that does not give them a minimum standard of living that prevails in that particular area to which I have referred. It is obvious that, if they do not get enough to meet their necessities, they must go to a relief agency, or they must go to friends, or go to relatives. I do not think that we should say to the wives and children of the men who are fighting this war that they must resort to that practice in order to get sufficient money to support themselves. The ones deferred in industry or agriculture are really selected by the Selective Service Act the same as the soldier is. To treat him impartially we should allow his family to subsist without resorting to charity or his saving account.

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. I yield.

Mr. ROLPH. Does the gentleman prefer the Sadowski amendment or the Clason amendment?

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. I prefer the Clason amendment. That is the amendment that a good many of us on the Military Affairs Committee suggested to the committee. I have no objection to the Sadowski amendment, but the Clason amendment is the one I favor, because I think it is exactly in line with what the Senate will do when this bill is sent over there, and if it is higher, they will cut it.

It passed the Senate by a vote of 77 to 1 and the figures are identical with the Clason amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Chairman, the preceding speaker has informed the House that the pay scale prepared by the Work Projects Administration for a family of four gives the figure of \$1,496 a year for Mobile, Ala.; \$1,809 a year for Washington, D. C.; and \$1,807 for the city of San Francisco, the figure he used.

If you take the figures of the House bill as presented here to us today and add on the amount of money we are paying a private; that is, the pay of a private after deductions, together with the amount of allotment for a wife and two children, you will find that under the House bill he is going to receive, for a total of a family of four, the figure \$1,476 annually, which is very close to the minimum figure that has been given, namely, \$1,496. Considering the pay of a private, first-class, the next rank, you will find he is going to get \$1,524, and when you reach the next grade it is \$1,663. Then take a sergeant. It is \$1,740.

The House bill takes the average pay of an enlisted man and approximates the average figure made up by the Work Projects Administration for the mainte-

nance level of cost of living. If you are going to take the other grades—and mind you, this is the first time you have included the first three grades—you will find that in the Navy, for example, the third-class petty officer in the fourth grade would receive \$233.50 per month as a result of this amendment; the second-class petty officer in the third class would receive \$251.50 per month; and if you get up to the second pay grade it increases to \$275.20; and when you get to the first pay grade, \$307.30. Multiplying that by 12 months gives a figure of \$3,600 that you are paying the top officers in the first grade with a family of four, and if anybody dares to say that the House bill has been niggardly in this respect I do not see how they can raise any such objection. That amount is exactly double the cost of living as shown for the city of Washington or New York, the two highest.

As a matter of fact you have got to keep this in mind that an ensign in the service of the Navy receives \$250 a month; a lieutenant, junior grade, gets \$283.67; a petty officer of the first pay grade is going to get more than either an ensign or a lieutenant, junior grade, under the figures of the existing bill as presented by the House. Moreover, the enlisted men in all seven grades are provided their own food and clothing, so these are not expenses he has to meet out of the monthly or yearly total of his pay combined with these allotments.

When you start to raise the amounts under the Clason amendment, and they would be higher under the Sadowski amendment, then the first-grade enlisted man will be receiving more, for a wife and two or three children, or as much as we are paying for a captain, a major, or a colonel.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COSTELLO. I yield.

Mr. CASE. If the House bill is enacted how does the gentleman justify the discrepancy against the second child of a divorced wife?

Mr. COSTELLO. When the gentleman asked that question before I tried to make myself clear on that.

Mr. CASE. The gentleman overlooks the fact that in the case of a wife divorced the increase for the first child is only \$15, and the total for a wife with two children, if living, is \$95, but the total for two children of a divorced wife is \$82; and \$8 is for the cut because of the divorced wife, and \$5 is because of the subsequent child or second child.

Mr. COSTELLO. I will say to the gentleman on that question that the bill ought to be amended to give an equal amount to the divorced wife as is allowed to the living wife.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN] is recognized for 3½ minutes.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, the figures given by Miss Faith Williams, Chief of the Cost of Living Division of the Bureau of Labor Statistics in the Department of Labor, are the best authority that we have before us on the cost of living. Those figures establish without

any contradiction that it would cost a wife \$64.39 and a child \$19.56 in the 33 cities for which the figures were compiled. There are 1,900,000 soldiers and sailors serving from those 33 cities. It is going to be mighty little solace to those 2,000,000 soldiers to state that the cost of living is less in the other sections of the United States and therefore the family allowance must be held down to a figure representing the average living cost throughout the Nation.

My position on this bill is based on one objective, and one only, and that is to maintain the morale of our fighting forces. You cannot browbeat the family allowance of 2,000,000 soldiers down below the cost of maintenance in those 33 cities and say you are maintaining the morale of the fighting forces. The building of morale of our fighting forces is the ground on which we should legislate here. There are about 157 other cities in the United States over 50,000 population. They are not included in those 33 sample cities you have before you in these statistics, and the 2,000,000 soldiers and sailors from those 33 cities are only a part of the soldiers and sailors who have to face high living costs. Now, let us get busy and build up the morale of our fighting forces and give these soldiers and sailors an allowance providing their families at home with a maintenance cost. According to the only figures we have, the figures placed before us for consideration, it will take \$80 for a wife and 1 child. We have held the figure to \$50 for the wife alone, although the testimony shows it should be \$64.39 for the wife. We did that because many of the wives find an opportunity to work, and we have held it down to \$50 because we think that is equitable; but when the wife has a child to care for she can no longer work away from home and care properly for that child at home. It then becomes very necessary to lift the allowance for the wife and 1 child up to \$80. That will give them maintenance support in the home.

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. I am sorry; I have not time.

That is the basis on which I have reached my conclusion to support the Clason amendment to give the wives and children at home maintenance support. In the sample cities we have accurate and dependable data concerning the amount it will take to support them at a maintenance level. That is not living on any extravagant scale in those cities, according to the testimony we have before us. I will not subscribe to any argument that strikes a general average over the United States. The general average of living over the whole United States is less than that figure, and such an allowance will not meet the maintenance needs in the cities listed. Let us keep the morale of all our soldiers and sailors at a high level by providing a maintenance level in the allowances for the families of our soldiers and sailors.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] is recognized for 3½ minutes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, first let me say I propose to offer a perfecting amendment to both the Sadowski substitute and the Clason amendment. My amendment is to add the word "former" before the words "wife divorced" wherever they occur. This is simply to perfect the language to bring it into line with the basic law.

Furthermore, let me say I am inclined to agree with the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] that a second child in those cases he mentioned should have had the \$20, and in the event these two amendments are voted down, if he does not offer such an amendment, I shall be very glad to do so.

The subcommittee decided to bring out a bill here that would take into account the cost of living, a reasonable cost of living. I believe that perhaps the best statement that has been made on it so far was the statement made by the gentleman from California, and that is that in voting this thing we have not overlooked the fact that the husband is still earning some money, even though it may not be a great deal. He gave the figures. A point to remember in this connection also is that when they go to foreign duty they get 20 percent additional.

When you start talking about your family of four, remember that includes the husband, the wife, and two children.

Miss Williams testified before our committee, and I suggest that every one of you read her testimony. She testified that it would cost approximately \$83 for a wife and one child. She testified that that budget included items that might not have to be taken care of under the present arrangements. For instance, just one I happen to think of now is the item of insurance. The Government carries the insurance under the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act for the serviceman and in addition allows him to take out \$10,000 very cheap insurance under the National Life Insurance Act. I believe this budget she presented includes \$46 a year or \$4 a month approximately for that insurance item alone. There are a few other items, not a great many, but if you will study those hearings and compare our statistics you will see that the figures that came from the committee are just about as close to the figure for the country as a whole as we could possibly arrive at.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I do not have time; I am sorry.

Goodness knows, I would never stand in the way of paying to the dependents of our servicemen a single dime to which they were entitled. It is the cost of making war; but at the same time I think it is only right and fair that we keep our heads and not run away with this thing. I think we have a right to tie it to the cost of living, and we did not tie it to the lowest level. Three different levels of living costs have been established. The first was a mere subsistence level. We did not tie to that. The next was a

maintenance level. I submit to you that our figures are tied just as closely to the maintenance level as they can be, based upon the testimony of Miss Williams and upon the budgeted family expenses established by a study that was made by the W. P. A. in 1935. We tied to that as closely as anybody could, taking into consideration the present cost of living; and I submit to you that the figures we give are fair.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY] is recognized for 3½ minutes.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, the longer I serve in Congress and the more experience I have in dealing with difficult legislation the more I am convinced that the practice and rule of following a legislative committee as far as you can possibly do so is a wise one. We have here a situation where we have either got to strike a level of rates or we have to legislate one way for Alaska, another way for Puerto Rico, and still another for the whole of the United States.

Your committee gave careful consideration to this legislation. I have never seen a subcommittee work more diligently, more cautiously, and with a greater degree of energy and industry in all of my experience in this House than did the subcommittee dealing with this legislation. I am not going to repeat again the figures that I stated previously because it is not necessary. There are men here, however, who were not here when we engaged in general debate the other day and who perhaps did not get the table of figures paid to the dependents of the fighting men by foreign governments. I want to call attention briefly to two of them.

Great Britain is one example. A wife receives \$5.60 per month, the first child \$6.80, the second child \$6.40, and each additional child \$5.60. In that great country, Russia, with four times the area of the United States, \$5 for a family of one, \$5.20 in an urban community, \$7.60 in a rural community, and likewise all the way down the scale.

When I was in my home town a few days ago, I asked a banker who is now cashier of the bank I operated for 20 years myself: "Where are you getting all of this money that you have in this surplus cash account in the bank?" He said: "That comes largely from allowances and allotments coming back to the dependents of our soldiers on the battle fronts." Then I walked out of the bank, and as I went across the sidewalk out into the street I met a lady who had written me a letter I did not know I had received. She was from a rural community, and she called my attention to it. When I got back to Washington I hunted it up, read it, and answered it. What do you suppose she was talking about? She is a member of a reputable farm family living on a farm in my county. She had written me a letter saying that she had been designated by a group of women who had asked her to tell me that we ought not to increase these allowances at all because the time had come when women were running the soldiers down

to marry them for the money they would receive and you could not hire a servant for any price. That is on the subject, too, of the manpower shortage. That idea prevails, too, in many sections of the country, in the rural and urban sections, and in the great cities.

There was nothing we could do but draw a level or scale, and we have drawn it to increase this allowance in the Senate bill by \$350,952,000, which, I believe, is an adequate increase and will most likely go far beyond that when we go to inducting the fathers with additional families, so that the cost of this legislation will run far beyond \$2,000,000,000.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that the two amendments, the original and the substitute, will be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SADOWSKI].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SADOWSKI), there were—ayes 48, noes 140.

So the substitute was rejected.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk to the Clason amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SPARKMAN to the Clason amendment: Before the words "wife divorced", wherever they occur, insert the word "former."

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Chairman, I am willing to accept the amendment.

The amendment to the Clason amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CLASON] as amended.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MAY), there were—ayes 163, noes 46.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SADOWSKI: On page 12, lines 23 and 24, after the words "One parent but no brother or sister" strike out remainder of paragraph up to and including line 5, on page 13, and insert "\$55; two parents but no brother or sister, \$90; one parent and one brother or sister, \$90, with an additional \$30 for each additional brother or sister; two parents and one brother or sister, \$120, with an additional \$30 for each additional brother or sister; a brother or sister but no parent, \$42, with an additional \$30 for each additional brother or sister."

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MILLER of Connecticut: On page 12, line 19, after the word "child" insert "No payment may be paid to any wife or divorced wife in class A, who has an income of \$1,500 per annum. An affidavit from either the serviceman or his wife stating that they have an income of less than \$1,500 per annum shall be accepted as proof of the right of a wife to receive such class A allotment."

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, this amendment may not be

as popular as the amendment we have just adopted, the Clason amendment. I supported the Clason amendment. While I believe in economy, I do not want to practice economy at the expense of the dependents of men now in our armed forces. I fear we have reached the point in this country where from now on when appropriation bills are presented to us we must consider more than whether or not the proposal is desirable. We must determine whether we can afford everything that is desirable. In our own private lives during this period of war we all have things we would like to do, expenses we would like to undertake, improvements we would like to have at this time, but as prudent citizens we put off those improvements until this war is out of the way. I think this Congress has to consider these appropriations in that light.

I know it will be contended that this will make the act difficult to administer; that it will be hard for the War Department to determine whether or not the wife is eligible for an allotment under the act. However, in the amendment, I have stated as clearly as I know how that the affidavit of the soldier or of his wife that they have less than a \$1,500 income will be accepted by the War Department as adequate proof of the truth of the statement. I believe the wives of our servicemen are honest, and I would be willing to accept their statement without affidavit and without having the statement notarized.

Mr. CRAVENS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. CRAVENS. Assuming a man would go into the service today and serve 3 or 4 months, and he or his wife would make this application, how is she going to know until the end of the year whether or not she will have an income of \$1,500? Are you going to deprive her of that allowance for a year until you determine whether or not she has that income?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. If she had an income of \$1,500 in the year previous and has a monthly income of that rate, all right, let her make the statement that she has an income of \$1,500.

Mr. CRAVENS. What if she does not have it now?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. If the income stops, then she can file for the allowance.

Mr. CRAVENS. How can she know until the year is over whether or not she will have an income of \$1,500?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. How does the gentleman know how much income he has on which to pay an income tax?

Mr. CRAVENS. I do not, although I doubt very much that it is going to be \$1,500.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Net. I am inclined to agree with the gentleman. There may be a few isolated cases where there will be a slight delay, but if there is going to be an argument as to whether they have \$1,100 or \$1,500 a year they

are not going to suffer any during the time that is being determined. We have that in connection with other allotments. We do that with parents who are dependents. In many cases the parents of men in the service are just as dependent, and have been just as dependent on the son in the service as any wife would be. I do not know of any great amount of delay with regard to the other classes of allotments. It seems to me from our experience with the parents, the class B and B-1 allotments, that the class A allotments can be proved just as fast as they can.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. Does the gentleman's amendment require both the wife and the soldier to make the affidavit?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. No; either the soldier or his wife.

I have not touched the allotment for the children in any way at all. The only change I make, like the gentleman from Michigan, is in connection with the divorced wife. I raised that question as to whether it is wise to pay \$42 a month to the divorced wife. I yield to the judgment of the committee on that.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. Does the gentleman's amendment apply only in the case of the divorced wife?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. No, it applies to all wives. It simply means that if a wife has an income of \$1,500 a year she does not get the allotment.

Mr. CURTIS. The gentleman is basing that upon the equivalent of \$1,500 a year after the husband is in the service?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Yes, absolutely.

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. BISHOP. Does not the gentleman believe that will discourage a lot of mothers from going back to work?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. How could it discourage them? It does not apply to mothers at all.

Mr. BISHOP. Just to wives?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Just to wives. It does not touch the other classes at all. It simply puts the wives on the same basis as far as the application is concerned as the other dependents.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. The gentleman's amendment applies solely to divorced wives?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. No, to all wives.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 6. (a) That section 106 (a) of such act is amended by striking out in the sixth and seventh lines thereof the words "both class A and class B" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "more than one class of" and by striking out the last sentence thereof.

(b) That section 106 (b) of such act is amended to read as follows:

"(b) Whenever a division is made of payments of monthly family allowance among dependents of a class, the total amount payable under the provisions of section 105 of this title to or for the benefit, respectively, of two or more children, of two parents, or of two or more brothers and sisters, shall be equally divided among the respective children, parents, or brothers and sisters, or shall be otherwise apportioned and paid within the respective groups as the Secretary of the department concerned may direct. The monthly family allowance to class B dependents shall be payable to only one designated dependent unless the Secretary of the department concerned shall direct that the prescribed amount be apportioned among and paid to two or more of such dependents."

(c) That section 106 (c) of such act is amended by striking out the entire subsection and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(c) Notwithstanding any other provisions of this title, in any case in which a family allowance is granted under this title—

"(1) to a wife living separate and apart from the enlisted man under a permanent or temporary court order or decree or written agreement, the amount of the family allowance payable to such wife shall not exceed the amount provided in such order, decree, or written agreement to be paid to such wife, and if such order, decree, or written agreement provides no amount to be paid to such wife, no family allowance shall be payable to her; or

"(2) to a former wife divorced, the amount of the family allowance payable to such former wife divorced shall not exceed the amount fixed in the court order or decree as the amount to be paid to such former wife divorced.

"In any case in which the application of the provisions of this subsection results in payment to a dependent or dependents of an enlisted man in an amount less than \$22, the amount by which the pay of such enlisted man is reduced or with which it is charged shall be the amount of such payment. In every other case in which application of this subsection alone or in conjunction with other provisions of this title results in a payment or payments of \$22 or more the amount of such reduction or charge shall be as provided in subsection 106 (a)."

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Chairman, I offer a perfecting amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CLASON: On page 13, line 17, after the second comma, insert "of a former wife divorced and one or more children."

Line 19, after "parents", insert "former divorced wife."

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of my amendment is to take care of a case where there is a divorced wife with children, and the children instead of living with the divorced wife, their mother, may be living with their grandparents or with some other person. Unless provision is made here for the money to be distributed by the Secretary of War as between the divorced wife and the children, wherever they may be living, it is possible that a divorced wife

who did not succeed in securing custody of the children would obtain their allowance. The purpose of my amendment is to cure that situation.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MICHENER: On page 13, line 7, after the word "amended", strike out the remainder of the section and insert in lieu thereof to read as follows:

"Sec. 106. (a) For any month for which a monthly family allowance is paid under this title to the dependent or dependents of any such enlisted man the monthly pay of such enlisted man shall be reduced by, or charged with, the amount of \$22, and shall be reduced by, or charged with, an additional amount of \$5 if the dependents to whom such allowance is payable include more than one class of dependents.

"(b) Whenever a division is made of payments of monthly family allowance among dependents of a class the total amount payable under the provisions of section 105 of this title to or for the benefit, respectively, of two or more children, of two parents, or of two or more brothers and sisters, shall be equally divided among the respective children, parents, or brothers and sisters, or shall be otherwise apportioned and paid within the respective groups as the Secretary of the department concerned may direct. The monthly family allowance to class B dependents shall be payable to only one designated dependent unless the Secretary of the department concerned shall direct that the prescribed amount be apportioned among and paid to two or more of such dependents.

"(c) Notwithstanding any other provisions of this title, in any case in which a family allowance is granted under this title—

"(1) to a wife living separate and apart from the enlisted man under a permanent or temporary court order or decree or written agreement, the amount of the family allowance payable to such wife shall not exceed the amount provided in such order, decree, or written agreement to be paid to such wife, and if such order, decree or written agreement provides no amounts to be paid to such wife, no family allowance shall be payable to her; or

"(2) to a former wife divorced, the amount of the family allowance payable to such former wife divorced shall not exceed the amount fixed in the court order or decree as the amount to be paid to such former wife divorced.

"In any case in which the application of the provisions of this subsection results in payment to a dependent or dependents of an enlisted man in an amount less than \$22, the amount by which the pay of such enlisted man is reduced or with which it is charged shall be the amount of such payment. In every other case in which application of this subsection alone or in conjunction with other provisions of this title results in a payment or payments of \$22 or more the amount of such reduction or charge shall be as provided in subsection 106 (a)."

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, just a moment. Is the gentleman offering the amendment at this time, a copy of which was left with me?

Mr. MICHENER. Yes.

Mr. MAY. The amendment relates to sections all the way through the bill.

Mr. MICHENER. The gentleman from Michigan has prepared a series of

eight amendments providing a redraft for eight sections of the bill. The amendments in no way change the language of the committee substitute. The gentleman from Michigan presented to the gentleman from Kentucky, the chairman of the committee, carbon copies of his proposed amendments. I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that what he holds in his hand are eight pages, with an amendment on each page, and the pages numbered 1 to 8, inclusive. He seems to be laboring under the misapprehension that I have proposed but one amendment rather than eight.

When the rule making this bill in order was before the House, I discussed the vague, indefinite, and improper method of draftsmanship. Those remarks will be found on page 8339 of the RECORD of October 14, 1943, and may I hope that the gentleman from Kentucky, as well as the other members of his committee, will do me the courtesy of reading those remarks?

I was called from the Chamber just before the general debate closed and was not permitted to offer my amendments to the first four sections of the bill. I have no amendments to section 3 and section 5. I have an amendment to section 6.

I can best illustrate the purpose of my amendments by calling attention to sections 2 and 3 of the bill. All that I attempt to do is to require the form of draftsmanship throughout the entire bill used in section 3. This eliminates such amendments as "changing the period at the end thereof to a comma and adding the words," and so forth. I am sure that every member of the distinguished Military Affairs Committee will agree with the soundness of my proposals.

However, inasmuch as the Clason amendment has been adopted, and an additional amendment made to section 6, I am convinced that the best results can be obtained by simply offering my amendments at the proper places in the bill, in order that those who read the RECORD will know what the bill is intended to mean, and for the special purpose of calling the attention of the conferees to the advisability of redrafting the bill in intelligent, understandable, and comprehensive language.

Mr. MAY. The question that I am raising with the gentleman is not a technical question, as to waiving any amendment, but if you put in any part of the amendment, why not put it all in. I think the gentleman has let his foot slip a little on the draftsmanship himself, because if you will read the first one on page 11, line 5, you provide after the word "amended," to strike out the remainder of the section and insert "in lieu thereof to read as follows." That should be "insert in lieu thereof the following."

Mr. MICHENER. No; the gentleman is again wrong. If the gentleman will bear with me for a moment, if the amendment which I have suggested were included in section 1 of the bill, the section would read as follows:

"That section 101 of the Servicemen's Dependents and Allowance Act of 1942 (56 Stat., and so forth) is amended to read as follows:

There follows the section of the law as it will read as amended. Exactly the same form is used in section 3 of the committee bill, which is proper draftsmanship—instead of saying, "by changing the period at the end thereof to a comma and adding the words," and so forth, which is but the writing of a formula to be followed in the drafting of the law. How ridiculous to require the people who are to be controlled by a law to perform a mechanical operation before they know what the law is.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. Yes.

Mr. MAY. I am not objecting to the gentleman's amendment at all. On the other hand I am inclined to agree with him, but I still insist his language is wrong, because he says to strike out the remainder of the section and insert in lieu thereof "to read as follows:" It should be "insert in lieu thereof the following," and then copy the section.

Mr. MICHENER. If the gentleman will look at the amendment, a copy of which I gave him—

Mr. MAY. I have it.

Mr. MICHENER. After the word "amended" on line 5, page 11, of the bill the section of the law is amended "to read as follows."

Mr. MAY. It does not read that way here.

Mr. MICHENER. It must read that way in the amendment the gentleman has before him, because it is a carbon of what I have before me.

The necessity for these amendments was spectacularized when I received an inquiry from a young man, subject to the draft, who has dependents, who wanted a copy of S. 1279, as amended by the committee. He was provided with a copy but was unable to work out the formula suggested in the bill, of striking out and inserting words and changing commas to periods, to find out just what the bill meant. There did not happen to be a lawyer in his home town with a copy of the United States statutes and, therefore, the bill was all Greek to this young man and the town lawyers. The Congress would be entitled to much censure if it placed such uncertain legislation on the statute books. That is my only interest in offering these amendments.

I shall offer my amendments to the subsequent sections of the bill as they are read; that is, provided I can get recognition before perfecting amendments to the text are adopted. Otherwise, I shall offer these amendments for the information of and consideration of the conferees.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, did the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER] couple with that a request to print in the Record all of the series of corrective amendments that he had in mind to offer? It seems if we are going to get any benefit from those we should have all of the amendments printed in the Record.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the suggestion of the gentle-

man from South Dakota and ask unanimous consent that following section 1, sections 2, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, and 12 of the committee bill where insert and strike-out language is used, that the amendments which I have sent to the desk may be read immediately following the reading of the respective sections by the Clerk and be printed in the RECORD at the points read. Let us hope that no more bills are presented to the House for consideration which are drawn in this manner.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 7. (a) That section 107 of such act is amended by striking out all before the first proviso, including the word "Provided", and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 107. (a) An initial family allowance shall be paid for the month in which an enlisted man enters a pay status in the active military or naval service of the United States, in the amounts and to the dependents hereinafter set forth.

"Such initial family allowance shall be paid to the designated dependent only when a written application therefor is filed by such enlisted man within 15 days after the date of his entry into active service in a pay status and shall be paid as soon as practicable after the filing of such application.

"No monthly family allowance shall be paid to any dependent of an enlisted man for the month for which any initial family allowance is paid to any dependent of such enlisted man.

"Notwithstanding the provisions of any other section of this title, the full amount of such initial family allowance shall be paid by the Government, and no reduction in or charge to the pay of the enlisted man shall be made for such payment.

"The amount of the initial family allowance payable to the dependent or dependents shall be—

"(1) \$50, if such enlisted man has a wife but no child;

"(2) \$75, if such enlisted man has a wife and one child, \$95 if a wife and two children, and an additional \$15 for each additional child;

"(3) \$42, if such enlisted man has no wife but has one child, and an additional \$15 for each additional child;

"(4) \$50, if such enlisted man has one parent dependent upon him for chief support; \$68 if such enlisted man has one parent and one brother or sister dependent upon him for chief support, and an additional \$11 for each brother or sister dependent upon him for chief support;

"(5) \$68, if such enlisted man has two parents dependent upon him for chief support, and an additional \$11 for each brother or sister dependent upon him for chief support;

"(6) \$42, if such enlisted man has no parent but has a brother or sister dependent upon him for chief support, and an additional \$11 for each additional brother or sister dependent upon him for chief support.

"Payment of the initial family allowance shall be made to one payee for each class of dependents, as defined in section 103, for whom an allowance is requested.

"(b) The monthly family allowance provided for by this title shall be paid for the period beginning with the first day of the month in which application therefor is filed, or the first day of the month in which the dependent or dependents first become en-

titled thereto, whichever is later, subject to the provisions of subsection (a) of this section, and shall be terminated or reduced, as may be required, on the last day of the month in which the disbursing officer paying the allowance receives notice of a change in status of the enlisted man or a dependent which terminated or limited the right of his dependent or dependents to receive such allowance: *Provided*, That the entitlement to family allowance shall terminate or be modified at the end of the month in which such change in status of the enlisted man or a dependent occurs: *Provided further*,"

Amendment offered by Mr. MICHENER: On page 15, line 6, strike out lines 6 and 7 and insert in lieu thereof to read as follows:

"SEC. 107. (a) An initial family allowance shall be paid for the month in which an enlisted man enters a pay status in the active military or naval service of the United States, in the amounts and to the dependents hereinafter set forth.

"Such initial family allowance shall be paid to the designated dependent only when a written application therefor is filed by such enlisted man within 15 days after the date of his entry into active service in a pay status and shall be paid as soon as practicable after the filing of such application.

"No monthly family allowance shall be paid to any dependent of an enlisted man for the month for which any initial family allowance is paid to any dependent of such enlisted man.

"Notwithstanding the provisions of any other section of this title, the full amount of such initial family allowance shall be paid by the Government, and no reduction in or charge to the pay of the enlisted man shall be made for such payment.

"The amount of the initial family allowance payable to the dependent or dependents shall be:

"(1) \$50, if such enlisted man has a wife but no child;

"(2) \$75, if such enlisted man has a wife and one child, \$95 if a wife and two children, and an additional \$15 for each additional child;

"(3) \$42, if such enlisted man has no wife but has one child, and an additional \$15 for each additional child;

"(4) \$50, if such enlisted man has one parent dependent upon him for chief support; \$68 if such enlisted man has one parent and one brother or sister dependent upon him for chief support, and an additional \$11 for each brother or sister dependent upon him for chief support;

"(5) \$68, if such enlisted man has two parents dependent upon him for chief support, and an additional \$11 for each brother or sister dependent upon him for chief support;

"(6) \$42, if such enlisted man has no parent but has a brother or sister dependent upon him for chief support, and an additional \$11 for each additional brother or sister dependent upon him for chief support.

"Payment of the initial family allowance shall be made to one payee for each class of dependents, as defined in section 103, for whom an allowance is requested.

"(b) The monthly family allowance provided for by this title shall be paid for the period beginning with the first day of the month in which application therefor is filed, or the first day of the month in which the dependent or dependents first become entitled thereto, whichever is later, subject to the provisions of subsection (a) of this section, and shall be terminated or reduced, as may be required, on the last day of the month in which the disbursing officer paying the allowance receives notice of a change in status of the enlisted man or a dependent which terminated or limited the right of his dependent or dependents to receive such allowance: *Provided*, That the entitlement to

family allowance shall terminate or be modified at the end of the month in which such change in status of the enlisted man or a dependent occurs: *Provided further*, That in the case of any dependent of an enlisted man in active service on the date of enactment of this act, if application is filed for a monthly family allowance within 6 months after such date of enactment or within such longer period as may be prescribed in special cases by the Secretary of the department concerned, the period for which such family allowance shall be paid shall begin with the date on which such dependent first becomes entitled thereto under section 101: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy may, by regulations prescribed by them jointly, fix the dates of commencement and termination of any such family allowance on any dates not more than one month before or one month after the dates above prescribed. Such regulations shall in no event provide for the payment of such allowances for any period prior to June 1, 1942, or for any period when the United States is not engaged in a war declared by Congress and which is more than 6 months later than the date of termination of any such war."

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CLASON: On page 16, line 7, strike out all of lines 7 to 12 inclusive and insert in place thereof the following language:

"2. Eighty dollars if such enlisted man has a wife and one child, and an additional \$20 for each additional child;

"3. Forty-two dollars if such enlisted man has no wife but has one child, and an additional \$20 for each additional child."

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Chairman, the whole purpose of this amendment is to bring these two paragraphs into accord with the amendment which has already been adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. CLASON. The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 8. That section 108 of such act is amended by inserting in the first line thereof after "Sec. 108", the subparagraph designation "(a)", and adding at the end of the section a new subsection to read as follows:

"(b) Except as otherwise herein provided, monetary allowances in lieu of quarters for dependents as authorized by section 10 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 shall not be payable for the period during which family allowances to dependents of enlisted men of the first, second, or third grades are authorized by this title. An enlisted man who, on the effective date of this act, is receiving, or, being entitled to a monetary allowance in lieu of quarters for dependents, has applied therefor, may, at his option, receive or continue to receive such monetary allowance or elect not to receive such monetary allowance and to have his dependents become entitled to receive family allowance. No dependent of any enlisted man shall be entitled to family allowance for any period for which such monetary allowance is paid to the enlisted man. An enlisted man's election to have his dependents receive family allowance may be made at any time and when made shall be irrevocable during the period of entitlement to family allowance as set out in section 101: *Provided*, That the secretary of the department concerned is authorized to make the election on behalf of the enlisted man in any case in which he deems it desirable and finds

it impracticable for the enlisted man to so elect, subject to termination at a later date upon specific request of the enlisted man. If an election is made the monetary allowance payments shall be discontinued at a date to be prescribed by the secretary of the department concerned. The monthly pay of any enlisted man of the first, second, or third grades who is provided with public quarters for his dependents and any of whose dependents is receiving a family allowance shall be reduced by, or charged with, 90 cents per day."

The CHAIRMAN. May the Chair inquire of the gentleman from Michigan? The Chair understood that the amendments are to be inserted in the RECORD following each section?

Mr. MICHENER. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. And not to be read?

Mr. MICHENER. No.

Amendment offered by Mr. MICHENER: On page 17, line 20, after the word "amended", strike out the remainder of the section and insert in lieu thereof—to read as follows:

"Sec. 108. (a) In any case in which any allotment from the pay of an enlisted man is already in effect at the time a monthly family allowance becomes payable under this title to a dependent or dependents of such enlisted man, such allotment may be continued, modified, or discontinued in accordance with such regulations as may be prescribed by the head of the department concerned.

"(b) Except as otherwise herein provided, monetary allowances in lieu of quarters for dependents as authorized by section 10 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 shall not be payable for the period during which family allowances to dependents of enlisted men of the first, second, or third grades are authorized by this title. An enlisted man who, on the effective date of this act, is receiving, or being entitled to a monetary allowance in lieu of quarters for dependents, has applied therefor, may, at his option, receive or continue to receive such monetary allowance or elect not to receive such monetary allowance and to have his dependents become entitled to receive family allowance. No dependent of any enlisted man shall be entitled to family allowance for any period for which such monetary allowance is paid to the enlisted man. An enlisted man's election to have his dependents receive family allowance may be made at any time and when made shall be irrevocable during the period of entitlement to family allowance as set out in section 101: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the department concerned is authorized to make the election on behalf of the enlisted man in any case in which he deems it desirable and finds it impracticable for the enlisted man to so elect, subject to termination at a later date upon specific request of the enlisted man. If an election is made the monetary allowance payments shall be discontinued at a date to be prescribed by the Secretary of the department concerned. The monthly pay of any enlisted man of the first, second, or third grades who is provided with public quarters for his dependents and any of whose dependents is receiving a family allowance shall be reduced by, or charged with, 90 cents per day."

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SPARKMAN: On page 18, line 10, change the period after the word "allowance" to a colon and insert the following proviso: "*Provided*, That payment of such monetary allowance shall be made only for such periods, from the effective date

of this act, as the enlisted man has in effect an allotment of pay, in an amount not less than the amount of such monetary allowance, for the support of the dependents on whose account the allowance is claimed."

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, we agree to that amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN].

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

I desire some information from the Chairman or some other member of the committee.

I would like to inquire when and how the dependents get the first pay; what action is necessary for the enlisted or inducted man to take?

Mr. MAY. An earlier section requires the dependent shall ask for the allowance or even the soldier himself upon induction, if not already in the service, when he goes to the induction center shall be furnished a voucher which he himself fills out for this advance payment we have provided here, in order to facilitate payment of allowance to dependents.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. The first payment or payment for the first month is not taken out of the soldier's pay?

Mr. MAY. If he has already made an allotment, it is taken out, but it is taken out after the first month that the inductee goes into the service.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. What I have reference to is this: Is that all the inductee has to pay of this after the 1st of November? In other words, the Government pays for all that—does it not—and there is nothing taken out of the serviceman's pay for the first month?

Mr. MAY. Why, certainly not. He does not pay any part of the first allowance. But that is after the 1st of November, and not the 1st of October.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Yes. Then what is meant by the section that the soldier must, within 15 days, make a statement as to his dependents?

Mr. MAY. That relates to the first payment when he goes in; he must, within 15 days after he is inducted, make an allotment to his beneficiaries and designated dependents.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Those dependents who get the first month's pay receive that out of the Treasury, no part of which is paid by the soldier. Does that include all the dependents provided for in this bill?

Mr. MAY. That includes all for whom provision is made.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I mean after November 1.

Mr. MAY. All class A dependents.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. That is confined to class A dependents or all of them.

Mr. MAY. No; it is all of them. On page 16 is set out in detail the ones to whom it is given.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Would it include all the dependents provided for in this bill after November 1?

Mr. MAY. No, not all of them, but those that are listed on page 16, with the

exceptions thereto. I can go through that page if the gentleman wishes.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. No, it is not necessary; it includes A, B, and B-1 dependents?

Mr. MAY. The list as contained on page 16 is intended to include all except the divorced wife.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Yes.

Mr. MAY. And class B dependents.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. The gentleman first asked what part the soldier himself paid. I understand that is for the first \$50, and for the second and subsequent amounts the soldier pays \$22 himself, does he not, and the Government pays the \$28 of the \$50?

Mr. MAY. That is for the wife and child.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. For the first month, I understand, the Government pays it all.

Mr. MAY. That is correct.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. For all dependents except the case of the divorced wife.

Mr. MAY. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 9. That section 109 of such act is amended by inserting after "Sec. 109" the subsection designation "(a)" and adding at the end of the section a new subsection to read as follows:

"(b) In the event of the death of a dependent, any amount of the family allowance to which his entitlement ceases with the last day of the calendar month in which death occurs, and which is uncollected at the time of death, shall be paid to such person or persons as the Secretary of the department concerned directs."

Amendment offered by Mr. MICHENER: On page 19, line 4, after the word "amended," strike out the remainder of the section and insert in lieu thereof, to read as follows:

"SEC. 109. (a) Any family allowance to which any dependent or dependents of any enlisted man is entitled under the provisions of this title shall be paid on behalf of such dependent or dependents to any person who may be designated by such enlisted man unless the Secretary of the department concerned determines that the person so designated is not an appropriate payee. In any case in which the Secretary of the department concerned determines that the person so designated is not an appropriate payee or in any case in which the enlisted man has not designated a payee, such allowance shall be paid on behalf of such dependent or dependents to such person as may be designated in regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the department concerned.

"(b) In the event of the death of a dependent, any amount of the family allowance to which his entitlement ceases with the last day of the calendar month in which death occurs, and which is uncollected at the time of death, shall be paid to such person or persons as the Secretary of the department concerned directs.

"SEC. 110. (a) Entitlement to and payment of any family allowance authorized under provisions of this title to the dependent or dependents of any enlisted man shall not be contingent upon pay accruing to such enlisted man or upon the monthly pay of such

man being reduced by or charged with any amount."

SEC. 10. That section 110 (a) of such act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 110. (a) Entitlement to and payment of any family allowance authorized under provisions of this title to the dependent or dependents of any enlisted man shall not be contingent upon pay accruing to such enlisted man or upon the monthly pay of such man being reduced by or charged with any amount."

SEC. 11. That section 119 of such act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 119. Any person who shall, directly or indirectly, solicit, contract for, charge, or receive or shall attempt to solicit, contract for, charge, or receive any fee or compensation for assisting in any manner an enlisted man or dependent in obtaining a family allowance payable under this title, shall, upon conviction thereof, be guilty of a misdemeanor and for each and every offense shall be punishable by a fine of not less than \$100 nor more than \$1,000 or by imprisonment at hard labor for not more than 2 years, or by both such fine and imprisonment."

SEC. 12. That section 120 (a) (4) of such act is amended by striking out the words "under oath" in the fourth line thereof.

Amendment offered by Mr. MICHENER: On page 20, line 10, after the word "amended," strike out the remainder of the section and insert in lieu thereof, to read as follows:

"(4) An illegitimate child, but only if the man has been judicially ordered or decreed to contribute to such child's support; has been judicially decreed to be the putative father of such child; or, has acknowledged under oath in writing, that he is the father of such child."

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BROOKS: Strike out section 12 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 12 (a). That section 120 (c) (4) of such act is amended by striking out the words 'under oath' in the fourth line thereof.

"(b) That section 120 (d) is amended by striking out the entire subsection and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(d) The term 'child' also includes a person to whom the man stands in loco parentis and has so stood for not less than 12 months prior to the date of application on behalf of such child."

"(c) That section 120 (g) be amended by striking out the word 'grandchild' in the first line thereof."

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, we have no objection to that amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Brooks].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to return to page 11 of the bill for the purpose of making a corrective amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BROOKS: Page 11, line 21, strike out the word "grandchild."

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, this amendment merely strikes out the word "grandchild," which now is surplusage in

the proposed act. I believe the committee has no objection to doing that.

Mr. MAY. The committee will accept the amendment, Mr. Chairman.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 13. That section 120 (i) of such act is amended to read as follows:

"(i) The terms 'man' and 'enlisted man' mean any enlisted individual, male or female, of the first to seventh grades, both inclusive, and any aviation cadet, in any of the services mentioned in section 101 of this act, and any member, except the leader and second leader, of the band of the United States Marine Corps, but do not include any member of the Philippine Army, the Philippine Scouts, the insular force of the Navy, the Samoan native guard or band of the Navy, or the Samoan reserve force of the Marine Corps."

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise at this time to ask the chairman of the committee a question. Section 13, on page 20, line 12, precludes the Philippine Army and the Philippine Scouts. They are precluded from the benefits of this act by reason of the establishment of the Army of the Philippine Commonwealth; but remember, the Philippine Scouts are in the Regular Army. I merely rise to ask why they were not included.

Mr. MAY. My understanding is that under the terms of a previous act when they are in service—which they are not at this time of course—they were paid on a rate based on foreign service, which is 20 percent additional. That is one reason. Another reason is that they are not now in position to receive the pay if we allowed it to them.

Mr. STEFAN. With that explanation I yield back the balance of my time.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 14. That such act be amended by adding a new section to title I thereof to be numbered 121 and to read as follows:

"SEC. 121. The dependents of an enlisted female shall be as prescribed by this title except that husband and children shall be included as dependents only when found by the Secretary of the department concerned to be dependent upon her for chief support. The amount of the family allowance payable to the dependents of an enlisted female shall be as prescribed by this title except that the amount for a husband or husband and children shall be that prescribed for a wife or wife and children. The provisions of this section shall be applicable to dependents of any enlisted female only insofar as such provisions are not inconsistent with the provisions of any law pertaining to the service of which she is a member."

SEC. 15. This act shall be effective from the first day of the calendar month following the month of enactment: *Provided*, That for the purpose of adjusting to the provisions of this act, any family allowance in force when the act takes effect, which is subject to change by the provisions of the act, may be paid without change for such period, not exceeding 4 calendar months, as the Secretary of the department concerned may determine: *Provided further*, That whenever such a family allowance is found to be subject to decrease or termination such change shall be effective at the expiration of the period of payment determined under the preceding proviso: *Provided further*, That

whenever such a family allowance is found to be subject to increase the effective date of increase shall be the effective date of this act.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PLOESER: At the end of the bill insert a new section, as follows:

"SEC. 16. That such act be amended by adding a new section to title I thereof to be numbered 122 and to read as follows:

"SEC. 122. That, subject to the limitations specified in subsection 2, every person who (1) serves in the land or naval forces of the United States at any time during the period beginning December 7, 1941, and ending on the date the President proclaims the termination of the present war, and (2) is separated from such service under honorable conditions or is released from active duty, shall be paid monthly, for a period of 10 months in the case of a person receiving the base pay of an enlisted man and for a period of 5 months in the case of any other person, an amount equal to the monthly base pay plus one-half of dependency benefits payable under this act in the case of enlisted men, and an amount equal to the monthly base pay in the case of all other persons. Such base pay shall be determined by the grade or period in which the person had been serving immediately prior to such separation or release. Such dependency benefits shall be determined by the benefits allowable on the date of separation or release and in no event shall a greater amount be payable due to subsequent additional dependents. Such period of 10 months or 5 months, as the case may be, shall commence on the date of separation from service or release from active duty or on the date of the enactment of this act, whichever date is the later. In the event any such person has been receiving base pay at a higher rate than the base pay of seventh grade in the case of enlisted men or of the first period in the case of all others, as prescribed in section 1 of the Pay Adjustment Act of 1942, he shall for the purposes of this act be considered to have been receiving the base pay of the seventh grade, in the case of enlisted men, and of the first period, in the case of all others.

"SUBSECTION 2. (a) A person shall be entitled to the monthly payments provided for by subsection 1 only after he files application therefor with the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy, as the case may be, stating, under oath, that his monthly income is less than the amount of the monthly base pay as described in subsection 1.

"(b) Monthly payments provided for by subsection 1 shall be made by check. Each check shall be mailed to the payee, together with a voucher to be filled out by him in which he shall state, under oath, the amount of his income for the month covered by the check. Such voucher shall be attached to the check by the payee and such check may be cashed at any post office only if accompanied by a properly executed voucher. The next monthly check shall be reduced to an amount equal to the difference between the amount of the monthly base pay which the payee had been receiving immediately prior to his separation from the service or release from active duty, as described in subsection 1, and the amount which the payee stated in such voucher that he had received during the month covered by the voucher. In the event any voucher discloses that the amount of income received by any payee for any month exceeded the amount of such monthly base pay, no further payment shall be made under this act unless another application is made in the same manner as the original application stating that the monthly income of the

applicant is again less than the amount of such monthly base pay.

"(c) The term 'income' as used in this section of this act shall mean cash income from any other source whatever than that provided by this section.

"(d) This section of this act shall become effective from the first day of the calendar month following enactment."

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment on the ground that it is not germane.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman reserve his point of order that I may explain my amendment?

Mr. MAY. Yes, Mr. Chairman; I will reserve the point of order.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to give serious consideration to the immediate post-war period, that period of transition when we will be demobilizing millions of men from the armed services and endeavoring to return them into civilian jobs here at home.

The purpose of the amendment is to prolong for a limited period of time the pay of all members of the armed services, after the war has ended, in order to assure them financial independence while they are reestablishing themselves in private enterprise.

It is universally agreed that the first and most important problem that will face the United States after the war is reemployment.

This proposal is intended to avert breadlines or any return to the political subsidy method of the W. P. A. in the post-war period.

Any post-war plans must allow sufficient time for industry to reconvert from war to peacetime production. Some industries will need more time than others.

Demobilization of millions cannot be accomplished at one given moment. It probably will require many months. This proposal calls for the orderly infiltration of these millions into a peacetime economy.

No man or woman in the armed services wants to come home, take off an honored and glorified uniform and be compelled to put on the humiliating livery of a political slave.

What they do want—what they are entitled to—and what our Nation owes every one of them is a job, and a good job in private industry.

This amendment allows them to preserve respectability and independence while they are readjusting themselves to peacetime pursuits.

Specifically, the amendment would: Provide a simple formula for extending the base pay of all people in the armed services, from the date of their discharge. It divides everyone in uniform into two groups: First, all those below the rank

of a commissioned officer; and secondly, all others.

For the first group, the amendment provides a flat extension of pay at the rate of \$50 per month plus one-half of any allowances for dependents. This extended pay would be continued for a maximum period of 10 months.

For the second group, the amendment provides a flat extension of pay of \$150 per month, regardless of rank and without any dependency allowances. This extended pay would be continued for a maximum period of 5 months.

To hold the ultimate total cost of the program to a minimum, the amendment requires recipients of the extended pay to deduct any earned cash income from each monthly allowance, after the first month. Whenever such income for any month exceeds the monthly allotment, the recipient automatically goes off the pay roll. In such cases, however, the person would be eligible—within the prescribed limited periods of 5 or 10 months—for restoration to the pay roll if his cash income fell below his allotment.

This feature of the amendment keeps the proposal outside the realm of a bonus and, instead, stimulates rehabilitation through individual enterprise.

Incorporated in the amendment is a carefully designed method for payment of the allotments intended to prevent maldistribution of Federal funds, either through bureaucratic political design or misrepresentations by individuals.

This provision, simplifying accounting procedure, has the approval of some fiscal officers in the armed forces, who point out that it would not require additional administrative personnel or expense.

The procedure set forth in the amendment calls for a voucher, as a part of the recipients' pay checks, on which they are required to make affidavits concerning their monthly cash income.

As of this date, Congress has done nothing to work out a systematic infiltration of the men in our armed services into civilian life; there has been total neglect of the post-war period on the home front, particularly where our armed forces are concerned. I see no more opportune time than today to put before this Congress something upon which we can vote, something which will prevent these men being demobilized into a new W. P. A. or a new breadline. The failure of this Congress to do anything to provide for their dismissal from the armed services speak loudly of the failure of the majority leadership. The leadership may care to procrastinate further. The fact remains that none of us knows when this war will end. It is possible that the war in the European theater may not last many more months. Time runs short while administrative and legislative leadership lags. The leadership on the majority side has done nothing to formulate such a provision. No program has been advanced whatsoever.

I want these men to come home and maintain their respectability. I do not want them to go back on a political

breadline. I want them to be respectable to themselves, to their families, and to be able to maintain those families while industry is working rapidly to provide jobs for them.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I do not know that I had completed my statement of the point of order.

The point of order is that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. PLOESER] is not germane to the pending bill and, in addition to that, the proposed amendment would amend the Pay Adjustment Act rather than the bill now pending before the committee. I insist on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Missouri desire to be heard?

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to be heard briefly on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman may be heard on the point of order.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, I realized at the time that I proposed the amendment that it is possible that someone might contend that this is an extension of the Pay Adjustment Act instead of the Dependency Allotment Act, but I submit that my intention is to extend into the post-war period for a brief and necessary time such aid to dependents as may become necessary due to difficulties in reemployment. If this aid is to be extended to dependents, it becomes desirable and necessary to extend into the post-war period the vehicle upon which dependency allowances are necessarily attached. I could not extend one without the other. The dependency allowance is, by virtue of statute now, an attachment to the base pay. It therefore became necessary, in order to extend one to extend both.

On that basis I am hopeful that the Chair may find the amendment germane to the bill now pending before the committee.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. BULWINKLE). The Chair is prepared to rule.

The amendment which the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. PLOESER] offers might apply to the Pay and Adjustment Act of 1942. However, the pay of the enlisted personnel of the Army cannot be germane to a bill which provides for maintenance to the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act of 1942.

The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to return to section 6, page 16, for the purpose of offering a perfecting amendment. In line 17, between the words "each" and "brother" add the word "additional", and in line 21, between the words "each" and "brother" add the word "additional", so that the language will read:

And an additional \$11 for each additional brother.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MAY: On page 16, line 7, between the words "each" and "brother" add the word "additional" and in

line 21, between the words "each" and "brother" add the word "additional."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Virginia: On page 22, line 5, after the period, add a new section, as follows:

"Sec. 16. That for the duration of this war, and for 6 months after the termination of the war, the provision of section 3 of act of June 13, 1940 (Public, No. 612, 76th Cong.), that relates to the compulsory retirement of brigadier generals at the age of 62 years and all promotion-list officers at the age of 60 years, is hereby suspended: *Provided*, That such suspension will be retroactive to June 30, 1942: *Provided further*, That no back pay will accrue to any officer affected by reason of such suspension: *And provided further*, That the officers retained in active service by reason of this action will be exclusive of those now authorized for the Army."

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I would like very much to see that provision made the law, but I am compelled to make the point of order that the amendment is not germane to the pending bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY] is sustained.

The question is on the committee substitute for the Senate bill.

The committee substitute was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the Chair, Mr. BULWINKLE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (S. 1279) to amend the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act of 1942, as amended, so as to liberalize family allowances, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 315, reported the same back to the House with sundry amendments agreed to in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a division.

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 389, nays 0, not voting 41.

[Roll No. 147]

YEAS—389

Abernethy
Allen, Ill.
Allen, La.
Andersen,
H. Carl
Anderson, Calif.
Anderson,
N. Mex.
Andresen,
August H.

Andrews
Angell
Arends
Arnold
Auchincloss
Baldwin, N. Y.
Barden
Barrett
Barry
Bates, Mass.

Beall
Beckworth
Bell
Bender
Bennett, Mich.
Bennett, Mo.
Bishop
Blackney
Bland
Bloom

Bolton
Bonner
Boren
Boykin
Bradley, Mich.
Bradley, Pa.
Brehm
Brooks
Brown, Ga.
Brown, Ohio
Bryson
Buckley
Buffett
Bulwinkle
Burchill, N. Y.
Burgin
Busbey
Butler
Byrne
Camp
Canfield
Cannon, Fla.
Cannon, Mo.
Capozzoli
Carlson, Kans.
Carson, Ohio
Carter
Case
Celler
Chenoweth
Chiperfield
Church
Clason
Clevenger
Cochran
Coffee
Cole, Mo.
Cole, N. Y.
Colmer
Compton
Cooley
Cooper
Costello
Courtney
Cox
Cravens
Crosier
Cunningham
Curtis
D'Alesandro
Davis
Dawson
Day
Delaney
Dewey
Dickstein
Dillweg
Dingell
Dirksen
Disney
Dittler
Domenegeaux
Dondero
Doughton
Douglass
Drewry
Durham
Dworshak
Eaton
Eberharter
Elliott
Ellis
Ellison, Md.
Ellsworth
Elmer
Elston, Ohio
Engel, Mich.
Engle, Calif.
Fay
Feighan
Fellows
Fenton
Fernandez
Fish
Fisher
Fitzpatrick
Flannagan
Fogarty
Folger
Forand
Ford
Gale
Gallagher
Gamble
Gathings
Gavagan
Gavin
Gearhart
Gerlach
Gibson
Gifford
Gilchrist
Gillette
Gillie
Goodwin

Gordon
Gore
Gorski
Gossett
Graham
Granger
Grant, Ala.
Grant, Ind.
Green
Gregory
Griffiths
Gross
Gwynne
Hagen
Haie
Hall
Edwin Arthur
Hall
Leonard W.
Halleck
Hancock
Hare
Harless, Ariz.
Harness, Ind.
Harris, Ark.
Harris, Va.
Hart
Hartley
Hays
Heffernan
Heidinger
Herter
Hess
Hill
Hinshaw
Hobbs
Hoch
Hoeven
Hoffman
Hollifield
Holmes, Wash.
Hope
Horan
Howell
Hull
Izac
Jarman
Jeffrey
Jenkins
Jennings
Jensen
Johnson,
Anton J.
Johnson,
Calvin D.
Johnson, Ind.
Johnson,
J. Leroy
Johnson,
Luther A.
Johnson,
Lyndon B.
Johnson, Okla.
Johnson, Ward
Jones
Jonkman
Judd
Kean
Kearney
Kee
Keefe
Kefauver
Kelley
Kennedy
Keogh
Kerr
Kilburn
Kilday
King
Kinzer
Kirwan
Kleberg
Klein
Knutson
Kunkel
LaFollette
Lambertson
Landis
Lane
Lanham
Larcade
Lea
LeCompte
LeFevre
Lemke
Leinski
Lewis, Colo.
Lewis, Ohio
Luce
Ludlow
Lynch
McCormack
McCowan
McGranery
McGregor

McKenzie
McLean
McMillan
McMurray
Maas
Madden
Magnuson
Mahon
Maloney
Manasco
Mansfield,
Mont.
Mansfield, Tex.
Marcantonio
Martin, Iowa
Martin, Mass.
Mason
May
Merritt
Michener
Miller, Conn.
Miller, Mo.
Miller, Nebr.
Miller, Pa.
Mills
Monkiewicz
Monroney
Mott
Mruk
Mundt
Murdock
Murphy
Murray, Tenn.
Murray, Wis.
Myers
Newsome
Norman
Norrell
Norton
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Brien, Mich.
O'Brien, N. Y.
O'Hara
O'Konski
O'Leary
O'Neal
O'Toole
Outland
Face
Patman
Patton
Peterson, Fla.
Peterson, Ga.
Pfeifer
Phillips
Phillips
Pittenger
Ploeser
Poage
Poulson
Powers
Pracht
Price
Priest
Rabaut
Ramey
Ramspeck
Randolph
Rankin
Reece, Tenn.
Reed, Ill.
Reed, N. Y.
Rees, Kans.
Richards
Rivers
Rizley
Robertson
Robinson, Utah
Robison, Ky.
Rockwell
Rodgers, Pa.
Rogers, Mass.
Rohrbough
Rolph
Rowan
Sabath
Sadowski
Sasser
Satterfield
Sauthoff
Scanlon
Schiffner
Schuetz
Schwabe
Scott
Scrivner
Shafer
Sheppard
Sheridan
Short
Sikes
Simpson, Ill.
Simpson, Pa.
Staughter
Smith, Maine

Smith, Ohio	Taber	Welch
Smith, Va.	Talle	Wheat
Smith, Wis.	Tarver	Wheichel, Ca.
Snyder	Taylor	White
Somers, N. Y.	Thomas, N. J.	Whitten
Sparkman	Thomason	Whittington
Spence	Tibbott	Wickersham
Springer	Tolan	Wigglesworth
Stanley	Towe	Winstead
Starnes, Ala.	Troutman	Winter
Stearns, N. H.	Vinson, Ga.	Wolcott
Stefan	Voorhis, Calif.	Wolfenden, Pa.
Stevenson	Vorrs, Ohio	Wolverton, N. J.
Stewart	Walter	Woodruff, Mich.
Stockman	Ward	Worley
Sullivan	Wastelowski	Wright
Sumner, Ill.	Weaver	Zimmerman
Summers, Tex.	Welch, Ohio	
Sundstrom	Weiss	

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—41

Baldwin, Md.	Hendricks	Smith, W. Va.
Bates, Ky.	Holmes, Mass.	Steagall
Burch, Va.	Jackson	Falbot
Burdick	McCord	Thomas, Tex.
Chapman	McGehee	Treadway
Clark	McWilliams	Vincent, Ky.
Crawford	Morrow	Vursell
Cullen	Morrison, La.	Wadsworth
Curley	Morrison, N. C.	Wene
Dies	O'Connor	West
Fulbright	Plumley	Willey
Fulmer	Rogers, Calif.	Wilson
Furlong	Rowe	Woodrum, Va.
Hébert	Russell	

So the bill was passed.

The clerk announced the following pairs:

General pairs:

Mr. Morrison of Louisiana with Mr. Holmes of Massachusetts.

Mr. Curley with Mr. Crawford.

Mr. Woodrum of Virginia with Mr. Wadsworth.

Mr. Thomas of Texas with Mr. Rowe.

Mr. Steagall with Mr. Treadway.

Mr. Hendricks with Mr. Willey.

Mr. Cullen with Mr. McWilliams.

Mr. McCord with Mr. Talbot.

Mr. McGehee with Mr. Plumley.

Mr. Fulbright with Mr. Wilson.

Mr. Chapman with Mr. Vursell.

Mr. Baldwin of Maryland with Mr. Morrow.

Mr. Furlong with Mr. Burdick.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(Mr. HOLIFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein some addresses delivered before a meeting of the American Federation of the Physically Handicapped at the National Press Club on the evening of July 9.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I have a special order to address the House for 10 minutes today. Due to the fact that there are a good many special orders for today, I ask unanimous consent that tomorrow, following the legislative program of the day and any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ELIZALDE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a speech by President Quezon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the Commissioner from the Philippines?

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD with regard to the Argentine situation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I further ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article by Rev. Andrew J. Kizesinski, Ph. D., which appeared in the Brooklyn Tablet on Saturday, September 4, 1943.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. GREGORY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a poem by Mr. Horace Carlisle on the life of the late Edward Creal.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article on the use of internee labor in building the Lewis and Clark Highway, and further to extend my own remarks and include therein certain excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address by President Quezon of the Philippine Commonwealth delivered at the University of Tennessee.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF] be permitted to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from a newspaper.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that tomorrow, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that tomorrow, following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON] for 20 minutes.

SUGGESTED SOLUTION OF JAPANESE PROBLEM BY DEPORTATION PURSUANT TO TREATY AT WAR'S END

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I intend to talk a few minutes about the problem of the Japanese. Unfortunately, I have not all of the data that I wish I had with me, and I intend to make a more extended talk on this matter soon. In considering the matter of the Japanese and the problem that will present itself after the war is over, certain things must be kept in mind. One of them is this, that all of the problems of the W. R. A., and the placing of the Japanese in war relocation camps, are merely transitory problems. When the war is over, the camps will be abandoned, and the Japanese, in my opinion, will largely return to the place where they had their property, their friends, and their former homes. The result will be that most of them will return to the west coast, especially to California. Another thing we have to consider is the fact that two-thirds of the Japanese in America, and there are about 130,000 of them, are American citizens, and they have certain rights, the same as any other citizen, which we must recognize.

I have presented certain legislation that I think will solve the Japanese problem. In the first place, I point out that the Japanese are a nonassimilable race. They have been here for 40 years, and during those 40 years not one one-hundredth of them have been assimilated, and no matter whether they are here for 100 years or 200 years, they will never become assimilated in the way that European races assimilate with the rest of the Americans.

The result is that we will have a group of brown people living in the community who will always stand apart and who will never, in my opinion, be thoroughly

American, like the people who come from Europe and other places. Also, it is a well-known fact, by those who have studied the problem, that the Japanese live a dual life. They live a Japanese life and they live an American life. They have a Japanese religion, and the Japanese language, Japanese schools and Japanese music, and all those things. The result is that that accentuates their differences, and will perpetuate them as a separate and distinct group of people. I believe it would have been far better for the Japanese and also for us if they had never come here in such large numbers.

My proposal in handling the problem is based upon the assumption that we are going to win the war so successfully and so completely that at the end of the war we will be in a position to present a treaty of our own dictation. My plan briefly is this. I have introduced Resolution No. 29 in the House, that provides that in any treaty made with Japan it shall contain, among other provisions, the following two provisions: First, that all alien Japanese be deported; second, that all those American-born Japanese, citizens, who by a court or any other appropriate governmental agency shall be found to be disloyal to the United States, or who shall have engaged in subversive activities by advocating the overthrow of the United States Government by force or violence, or who shall have given aid and comfort to any of our enemies, shall likewise, after public hearing, be deported to Japan. In order to implement that provision of this treaty I have provided for a Deportation Commission. It shall consist of three persons appointed by the President of the United States and confirmed by the Senate.

This Commission shall review the files of all of those Japanese-Americans whose records indicate they have in any way been guilty of disloyalty to the United States during or before our entry into the war. Those persons shall be given a public hearing and at this hearing the evidence adduced against the particular person shall be presented by the Government first. That person shall have the right of subpoena. He shall have the right to a lawyer of his own choice, and he shall have the right to hear the testimony against him and shall be permitted to submit testimony in his own behalf. Upon the adjudication of the public hearing, then the Commission shall make a finding, as to whether or not the particular person involved has been guilty of the different things which would denationalize him and make him subject to deportation. These things are whether he has been disloyal to the United States, whether he has engaged in subversive activities and recommended or advocated the overthrow of the United States Government by force or violence, and, third, whether he has given aid and comfort to the enemy. For instance, I see by the report that the President made of the Japanese relocation camps that 6,300 Japanese have refused to sign the oath of allegiance to the United States and want to go back to Japan. In other words, those particular people, in my opinion, would be the type who will be

deported to Japan and they should not now or later be allowed to change their mind. There are undoubtedly many more. I believe that this is a legal, a practical, and a constitutional way to solve the Japanese problem. We will take out all of the troublemakers, those who have created dissension, and the hostility toward the American Government on the part of the Japanese.

We will remove the aliens. It means that the Japanese who are left will be persons of whose record we can be sure, because if they had not had a good record they would have been called before the Deportation Commission, and the fact that they were not, shows that the bad group has been purged out and only the good ones are left. It will be a blessing to the white Americans; it will be a blessing to the Japanese-Americans.

I offer this as a very practical and common-sense solution of the Japanese problem. I trust that when I ask for hearings before the Committee on Foreign Affairs I will be able to get them to send the resolution to the floor of the House. I also trust that when the hearing comes on my bill, with some perfecting amendments, I may be heard and receive a favorable vote from the Committee on Immigration.

As I say, it is a very fair and very legal method of handling this problem. We have to admit that no matter how long the Japanese remain in America they never will become thoroughly assimilated. I recognize that those who are here, who have lived loyal, decent lives should not have their rights infringed upon; that we should allow them to remain here like any other citizens, but those whose record has been proved bad in the hearings before the Deportation Commission should be moved out and taken back to Japan where their heart and their ideas and their religion is.

Therefore I think I have a practical, constitutional scheme that will do complete justice to the bad ones and will do justice to the good Japanese who have been loyal to America.

I have little more to add except that in my plan I recognize fully the rights of the Japanese the same as any other segment of the population. It has been stated that there is friction between the Japanese and the so-called white Americans. My plan proposes to give every man his day in court. Those who have been loyal, and many of them have been, will have no fear of any reprisals whatever. They can go back and live in their former abode if they wish to. I think after hearings and the removal of the bad Japanese it will be much better and much more healthful for the loyal Japanese to live in their own homes.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. I yield.

Mr. JUDD. Does the gentleman think that the loyal Japanese themselves will object to the gentleman's proposal, or rather that they would welcome it?

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. I think a great many of them would welcome it. However, I do have one proposal that may be drastic and I would like to get the

gentleman's reaction on that. It is the removal of all aliens, which constitute about one-third of the population.

Mr. JUDD. You mean all alien Japanese?

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. All alien Japanese.

Mr. JUDD. Regardless of their behavior and so forth?

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. Yes. Of course, I have no objection to including any race that comes within the purview of my legislation; that is, any alien race.

Mr. JUDD. They might be Germans, Italians, or Japanese.

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. Yes.

Mr. JUDD. Offhand I would say I think those provisions of the bill which permit deportation after each man has had his day in court rather than on the basis that everybody who is an alien should be automatically removed, because a great many of those who are here came here because they were opposed to the regime that was in power in the old country. For instance, I talked to a man from Germany who was telling about the Germans who were admitted here after the last war. They are the saboteurs. They could not stand the republican regime in Germany. They were the old monarchists, so they migrated to this country and became citizens during the twenties, and many of them are not loyal.

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. In response to the gentleman I will say that I am more interested in moving out these Japanese and other enemy aliens who have been disloyal during the period of the war, as I consider their action treasonable. If they had a hearing as I propose, there would be no curtailing of their rights, but we will have to prove that they were disloyal. If we do prove that, they ought to be deported promptly.

Mr. JUDD. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. In the other enemy alien groups there are some people who also respond to that same formula. By our exercise of the treaty power we have our one chance to deport disloyal citizens by denationalizing them, and under the treaty provisions with Japan, Germany, and Italy, the terms of which treaties we will be able to dictate, provide for their deportation.

Mr. JUDD. That is right, I am sure, as to those aliens who are not citizens. Put it on a basis of loyalty.

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. There might be some way of sifting other aliens on the basis of loyalty.

Mr. JUDD. That would be my judgment.

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. I thank the gentleman for his reaction.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back such time as I may have not consumed with the statement that I shall soon submit a more comprehensive statement on the problem.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

JAPANESE IN CALIFORNIA

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, on October 11 the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER] stated that he regretted my remarks with respect to the War Relocation Authority and the Japanese situation and implied to this House that I did not know whereof I spoke, and that I was un-American.

In reply to the gentleman I wish to state that I believe that 90 to 95 percent of the people of California who have had direct business dealings with the Japanese cannot all be wrong; and I will wager anyone that he will find, if he contacts people who have had direct business dealings with the Japanese over a period of years, that 90 to 95 percent believe the Japanese are tricky and treacherous, and believe that between the United States and Japan, the Jap's first loyalty is to Japan. I say people who have had direct business dealings with the Japs. I will admit there are a few school teachers, ministers, and possibly the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER], who have come in contact with Japs through their activities, who believe there may be some Japs who are loyal to the United States, but, according to a poll taken in California answered by 1,468 people, there are many ministers and school teachers who do not believe that the Japs should be allowed to return to the west coast at this time, and only 2 people favored it. Also many of them who answered the poll went into detail as to why they voted that way.

The reason I made the statement I did on the floor of this House on October 11 was due to the fact that I wanted to prevent Japanese blood from being spilled in California, as it surely will be if the Japanese are allowed to return there. I do not blame the American people for bearing malice toward the Japanese race, and especially the people of my State, who know them so well.

I would like to say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that if his statement were true that the Japanese are loyal American citizens, then certainly it would seem that out of the 100,000 Japanese who were located on the west coast at the time of Pearl Harbor that at least one of them might have told us in advance that we were going to be attacked by the Japanese at Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941, and saved thousands of lives; yet not even one of these Jap rascals gave us a warning, and yet thousands of them knew of the coming attack and even fortified themselves by having in their possession ammunition, guns, and dynamite, so when the proper time came they could destroy their neighbors and friends with whom they had lived. If the gentleman from Pennsylvania thinks my statement was un-American, I would suggest that he get ready now to accept in his own community the thousands of Japs, who I know would welcome his hospitality, but I doubt very much whether the people of Pennsylvania would like to have Japs moved in as their neighbors at the close of the war, when many of their sons, because of the Japs' treacherous attack, will not return home. I want further to say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that I

will put myself up against him any time or any place as an American citizen.

A great many California people feel that there is danger to the safety of the released Japs if the Japs are returned to the Pacific coast at this time, and I do not believe that all these people are anarchists. Many of these people have close personal friends among the Japs, but this feeling, I believe, is for fear that some father and mother, sister or brother of some boy who has died—not having been killed in open battle but from some disease in prison camps as a result of refusal on the part of the Japanese to allow food and medicine to be sent through the Red Cross—might kill one of these Japs and as a result, through reprisals, cause the death of our boys who are still prisoners. For this one reason alone I, as an American, believe that for the protection of our boys the Japanese should be retained in our concentration camps where they are given adequate housing, food, medical care, and educational and recreational facilities, which is in vast contrast to the way our American prisoners are treated by the Japanese.

In Sacramento, Calif., on October 13, more than 1,000 delegates to the annual convention of the California State Grange heard State Grange Master George Sehlmeier propose the removal of all Japanese from the Nation at the war's end. The Grange master said:

It is next to impossible to segregate loyal from disloyal Japanese.

And summed up his post-war proposal for the Japanese in this statement:

We believe from the standpoint of justice to all concerned to safeguard American institutions and ideals and at the same time avoid future difficulties, the best course to pursue is, when the war ends, to return all Japanese to their homeland.

It is true that no sabotage has been committed by the Japanese in the United States, but had Japan invaded the United States the saboteurs were on hand and ready to do their bit to destroy human life and property just the same as they did at Pearl Harbor and Manila.

I wish further to state for the safety of the small number of Japanese who might be good, although no one knows, that they should not be permitted for the duration of the war to return to localities where people are so adverse to their return.

MUST EUROPE'S CHILDREN STARVE

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, on May 26 I introduced House Resolution 244 having for its purpose the removal of the ban against sending food to the starving children in the subjugated countries overrun by the Axis in Europe. Thus far no action has been taken on this or similar resolutions. I most certainly hope that the Congress will enact soon legislation which will let down the bars and save these children from starvation. I have been urging early action and I hope that all of my colleagues will give the matter consideration and join in the request for the enactment of such legislation at the very earliest time possible before it is too late.

The objections usually raised against the bill are the following:

First. The Nazis would take the food.

Second. The Germans might not take the food which we send, but would take an equivalent amount of local food out of the country.

Third. The Germans would reduce the ration cards of the children whom we helped, so that although the child might exhaust his ration card, the card itself would call for less food, which would leave a residue by which the Nazis could profit.

Fourth. We cannot burden the American taxpayer with additional expense.

In passing I want to say that it would not cost the American taxpayer anything.

Fifth. Ships cannot be spared to send the food.

Sixth. In view of our own growing shortage, we have not the food to spare.

Seventh. No American can work in any occupied country and we would not be sure of careful supervision.

These various arguments against the enactment of this legislation and the opposition to a program to save the children of Europe from starvation were so well answered by Dr. Howard E. Kershner in a recent address that I am including Dr. Kershner's address as a part of these remarks. Dr. Kershner is exceedingly well qualified to answer these objections. He is director of the International Commission for the Assistance of Child Refugees and a member of the executive committee of the National Committee on Food for the Small Democracies. He was director of relief in Europe from 1939 to 1942 for American Friends Service Committee. His long residence in Europe and his close contact and study of this most important relief problem have given him first-hand information which qualifies him to speak with authority. The address to which I refer is as follows:

HOW TO SAVE THE STARVING CHILDREN OF EUROPE WITHOUT AIDING THE ENEMY

Hitler's proud boast that the Germans are a superior race will come true to the extent that we allow him to destroy the freedom-loving people of Europe by starvation and to render those that are left, subnormal in mind and body. People who have eaten well are indeed superior to those who are undersized and riddled with disease.

It is not only good charity, but the best of strategy to save the starving children of the Nazi-dominated countries of Europe. These people are our friends and allies. They have fought for liberty for centuries before our country was born. They are still fighting for it. They crave our moral support and help. To save their children now would win their friendship and affection forever. We need their help now, and we shall desperately need it in the reconstruction days ahead. How will we ever reestablish democracy as the ruling philosophy of government if we allow Hitler to destroy the democratic peoples of Europe?

At no expense to ourselves and without using any ships or food which we or our allies need, it is possible to save many of these starving little ones. It is not only a human obligation, but it will help to shorten the war.

Having recently discussed this matter with many of the chief officials of the American and British Governments, with the heads of the governments of the Nazi-occupied countries, with the editors of the leading British and American publications, with thousands of individuals in the question periods following more than 100 public addresses in these

2 countries, and with a large number of correspondents in both countries resulting from nearly 50 previous radio talks, I should like to answer every doubt and difficulty that may be in your mind on this subject, and to show from experience how we can be sure that controlled child feeding would not aid the enemy, but would save the children, would give courage and strength to our friends and allies, and would make post-war reconstruction much less difficult.

OBJECTION 1. THE NAZIS WOULD TAKE THE FOOD

From 4 years' experience directing relief work in Europe, I am glad to report that the Nazis have never taken a mouthful of our food. Our own State Department is authority for the fact that the Germans do not take any of the 19,000 tons of food going to Greece each month, that the operation is of no benefit to Axis economy, and that it does save the Greeks. I received the same assurance from the Ministry of Economic Warfare in London last winter. Since the Germans do not take the food going to Greece and since they did not take our food in France, it is reasonable to assume that they would not take food which we might now send to Norway, Holland, Belgium, and France.

But assume the worst, suppose they did take it, what would be the result? As only small amounts would be sent at one time, they could not seize more than enough for one meal for the civilian population of Germany. This, of course, would immediately bring the operation to a close. The small gain accruing to Germany from having seized a little bit of food would be far outweighed by the psychological advantage on our side. Over the short-wave radio, we would tell our friends in Europe that we were anxious to feed their children, but that the Germans had taken the food, and the operation must, therefore, be stopped. We would have given them moral encouragement, we would continue to enjoy their affection and friendship, and we would have given the lie to the Nazi propaganda that these people are starving because of our blockade.

Thus, the very worst thing that could happen would be to our advantage. But experience indicates that the Germans would not take the food, and that the children would be saved.

OBJECTION NO. 2. THE GERMANS MIGHT NOT TAKE THE FOOD WHICH WE SEND, BUT WOULD TAKE AN EQUIVALENT AMOUNT OF LOCAL FOOD OUT OF THE COUNTRY

If the operation were properly controlled, they could not do this. Let me explain.

Every child helped should be required to exhaust its own ration card before being given a supplement of imported food. If the child eats all of the local food to which it is entitled—its full share—just as much as if no foreign relief were available, it is obvious that there is no equivalent left over as a result of the operation by which the Nazis could profit. True enough, the Germans take food from all of these countries, but the point is that they did not take any more as a result of our operations. In our colonies, we completely exhausted the French ration card of each child each month before drawing upon our supplies of imported food. We are certain, therefore, that this did not leave any indirect way by which the Germans could have profited.

OBJECTION NO. 3. THE GERMANS WOULD REDUCE THE RATION CARDS OF THE CHILDREN WHOM WE HELPED, SO THAT ALTHOUGH THE CHILD MIGHT EXHAUST HIS RATION CARD, THE CARD ITSELF WOULD CALL FOR LESS FOOD, WHICH WOULD LEAVE A RESIDUE BY WHICH THE NAZIS COULD PROFIT

From experience, I can tell you that the Germans did not do this. The children whom we helped continued to have exactly the same ration cards as the children whom we were not helping. This objection, therefore, falls down in the light of experience. The evi-

dence on this point is very clear, for the children receiving our extra rations maintained their health and continued to grow and gain weight, while the other unfortunate children stopped growing, developed anemia, rickets, and tuberculosis.

We should have been feeding at least 2,000,000 children in southern France alone, but we were not permitted to bring food through the blockade and had to depend upon supplies which we had bought in Asia, Africa, and Central Europe in 1940 and the early part of 1941. This forced us to limit the number of children fed to 100,000, imposing upon us the terrible necessity of deciding which children should eat and which should starve. With the help of the school physicians we selected the most needy children who were admitted to our canteens. The others, who were suffering almost as badly, would ask in polite though weak little voices why they too could not eat. I never found a satisfactory answer to the question of why a hungry child should not eat, especially when I came home and found that we were wasting more food than would be required to save the lives of these starving innocent little victims.

Of course, if the Germans discriminated against the children being helped, that would constitute a violation of the agreement and the operation would immediately be stopped, but up to now they have not done so.

OBJECTION NO. 4. WE CANNOT BURDEN THE AMERICAN TAXPAYER WITH ADDITIONAL EXPENSE

We are not asking for any money from our Government or by private subscription. Norway, Holland, Belgium, and France have funds of their own in this country more than sufficient to pay for all of the food that it is proposed to send. The operation could be financed by unblocking a portion of these funds. The heads of these governments have all assured me of their eagerness to use some of their resources in this manner. It would cost the American people nothing. These four countries are mentioned because, until recently, at least, Denmark was not suffering so severely, help is already going to Greece, and it is not possible to reach Czechoslovakia, Poland, and occupied Russia.

OBJECTION NO. 5. SHIPS CANNOT BE SPARED TO SEND THE FOOD

We would not use a single ship available for the war effort. Neutral ships which cannot be hired for war purposes would be used.

OBJECTION NO. 6. IN VIEW OF OUR GROWING SHORTAGE, WE HAVEN'T THE FOOD TO SPARE

A few weeks ago, I saw a dispatch from the Department of Agriculture in Washington, stating that the American people are still wasting enough food to feed 20,000,000 people the year around. That is more than 3 times as much as we are asking permission to send to Europe. We are, therefore, in the unenviable position of not being willing to allow a portion of the crumbs which fall from our table to be used to save the lives of our neighbors' children, who are the hope of the future.

All that it is proposed to send from this country is a little grain, of which we still have a surplus, and the meat, fat, and milk required could be brought from South America. Our own food scarcity, therefore, is no excuse for inaction.

Quite rightly, we will now begin feeding the Italians. But how will it look to the people of the occupied countries who have fought on our side for more than 3 years for us to continue starving them while we feed the Italians, who have fought against us for over 3 years? What faith will any people have in our moral protestations if we starve our own allies and friends? Military necessity might require the starvation of all of Europe if by so doing we could starve the enemy, but we cannot do that in any event. There is enough food in Europe to feed the

Germans, and we may be sure that they will get it. What we can do and are doing is to starve the democratic, freedom-loving people who are doing their valiant best for our cause.

OBJECTION NO. 7. NO AMERICAN COULD WORK IN ANY OCCUPIED COUNTRY, AND WE WOULD NOT BE SURE OF CAREFUL SUPERVISION

It is true that no American organization could work in these Nazi-occupied countries, but the International Red Cross, with a neutral personnel, which does it so well in Greece, is ready to undertake the responsibility of distribution. We may be sure, therefore, that the operation would be properly controlled.

These objections sum up the whole case against feeding, and they all disappear in the light of experience. There is, then, no reason why we should not send help to these children, and there is every reason of humanity and strategy why we should do so.

If these starving children were sitting on your doorstep tonight and you could see their piteous eyes, set in bloodless faces, begging even for the garbage from your kitchens, you would feed them. You could not eat yourself until you had done so. Because they are across the sea does not lessen their suffering or our obligation. Please help us mobilize public opinion on behalf of sending food to these tragic little victims of war. Tell your friends and neighbors how this can be done without aiding the enemy. Take the matter up in your societies, clubs, lodges, parent-teacher associations. Ask your ministers to preach about it. Write letters to your papers and ask our editors to write editorials. Make sure that your Senators and your Congressman, the President, and the Secretaries of State and War know how you feel about the matter.

Bipartisan House Resolution No. 117 asks the administration to take immediate action to save the children. I am sure your Congressman would welcome a letter from you, stating your opinion of this matter. Senate Resolution No. 100 is the same as the House resolution. I know your two Senators would be glad to have a letter from you on this subject.

Our officials in Washington are very favorably disposed toward making a controlled effort to help the children. Let us support and encourage them. I am not asking you to do anything opposed to the policy of our Government in beseeching you to help give a demonstration of the desire of the American people that these children be saved. Neither am I asking for any anti-British action, for I have overwhelming evidence that this cause is very popular in public and private circles throughout the British Isles.

On the platform, through the generous press, and over the air, I shall continue to report to you on various phases of the subject. Meanwhile, you can get copies of this talk and other literature from the National Committee on Food for the Small Democracies, 420 Lexington Avenue, New York 17. Please make your own influence felt in every possible way on behalf of these starving little ones. Remember the words of the Master, "It were better that a millstone were hanged about his neck and that he were cast into the sea than that he should offend one of these little ones." Will you do something about it?

With grateful thanks, good night.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] is recognized for 45 minutes.

NEEDED: A CODE OF RADIO GOOD BEHAVIOR

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to revise and extend my remarks and to include some editorial and extra-

nequely printed matter, some quotations and citations from magazines and newspapers.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, in these days of global warfare news stories of great significance tumble over themselves so rapidly that frequently a matter of primary importance on the domestic front gets far from the publicity it deserves. As a result, many citizens are sometimes months behind in the business of getting caught up with far-reaching developments on the home front.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the recent announcement of the Columbia Broadcasting System by which it self-imposed upon itself a voluntary code of radio good behavior and impartial performance is an item of this kind. Judging from the almost universal acclaim which this public-spirited action has won from Members of Congress and from impartial editors who have commented upon it, I believe this move on the part of C. B. S. is an epochal step in the direction of protecting free speech and fair play on the American radio. C. B. S. should be congratulated and supported on its patriotic decision to protect its listeners against propaganda and politics and to give all sides of all controversial issues an equal opportunity to be heard over its great radio network. It is hoped that the other radio networks will quickly follow this wise policy as enunciated by the Columbia Broadcasting System.

In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, the decision of C. B. S. to prevent the use of a semipublic monopoly such as radio by private individuals or commercial sponsors for propaganda or political purposes will do more to preserve private ownership and operation of radio in this country than anything which has happened since the advent of broadcasting.

Perhaps a few wealthy radio tycoons who own or control big radio outlets feel secure in their power and believe it to be reference to but a straw man when it is declared, as I am about to declare, that private ownership and operation of radio in this country is not a guaranteed certainty for even the next 4 years—to say nothing of the permanent future.

Let these big men of radio scoff if they want to—I happen to know that the danger that privately operated radio in this country may have a short life is not something to be blithely overlooked. Stockholders and officials of large radio corporations might well remember that indifference to danger signs along the way was precisely the attitude which trapped the great industrialists of Germany into becoming the servants of the Nazi political state. Indifference to public opinion and to public trends in this country may well do the same for our radio industry.

Those who are in authority for the moment in private radio have a responsibility to themselves, to their stockholders, to the cause of private radio, and to America itself, to discontinue flaunting bad practices in the face of public opinion and to take steps to elim-

inate them before they give cause to support existing plans to make radio a public instead of a private monopoly. For that reason, the far-sighted and public-serving decision of the executives of C. B. S. is not only gratifying to all those believing in the continuance of private radio but it is one which the executives of other radio networks might well emulate. It should not be forgotten that one persistent offender in the radio field may well break down the dike which is now holding back the flood waters of Government-operated radio.

As background for what I am about to say with regard to two important questions which must soon be settled by the radio industry, the Federal Communications Commission, and the Congress, Mr. Speaker, I want to call attention, briefly, to some previous considerations which I have given this subject and which appear in earlier issues of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

In the RECORD for May 30, 1940, under the title of "A Question Radio Executives Should Ponder Seriously—and Answer Carefully," I set forth some suggestions which, if followed, I hoped and believed would tend to safeguard private radio in this country and prevent it from flaunting its way into complete Government control or even ownership. Permit me here to read you a few paragraphs from those remarks:

A CHALLENGE TO THE SELF-RESTRAINT OF RADIO

Mr. Speaker, I have a passionate devotion to the American principle of free speech. But should such freedom, when exercised over air channels which are privately owned and from which others are excluded by governmental regulations, get out of bounds to the detriment of the public morale, it would become a public problem of vital concern to the entire Nation. Wise self-restraint, now, by the radio companies themselves is, in my opinion, a far better solution to the problem of hysterical excesses and unduly exciting and provocative broadcasts than any laws which Congress could devise. Surely such restraint can prevent the necessity of new legislation to meet the problem propounded by the question of what is and what is not public-serving broadcasting of war news.

We can still too well remember the results of Orson Welles' purely fictitious broadcasting of a fanciful invasion from Mars. So real did the highly emotionalized speeches of radio speakers appear that a near panic developed in many localities in America. Wisely, radio executives themselves took steps to prevent a repetition of such a sensational program to unnerve large portions of the populace. Confronted, too, with the problem of how much emotionalism and hysteria to convey over the air waves in reporting war news, it is my hope these same radio executives themselves, with no legislative stimulus or restraint, will use equal discretion in not permitting factual reporting to be colored by hysterical or emotional commentators whose inflections and intonations can well induce emotional upsets and develop panicky thinking if they carelessly or deliberately engage in all the histrionics of their art instead of functioning simply as reporters of news.

COMMENTATORS CULTIVATE THE "ILLUSION OF INTEGRITY"

On the other hand, especially among radio commentators who inject their personal opinions and emotions into the news, too frequently an attempt is made to create an "illusion of integrity" which leads the unwary listener to believe that what he hears

is more factual or fulsome and reliable than what he reads. Obviously, such is not the case because newspapers and radio stations, alike, are limited by the same conditions in foreign countries and all are circumscribed by the same foreign censors and the same propagandists who are in the business of distorting the facts for military or psychological purposes.

Following that discussion, Mr. Speaker, I received a telephone call and then a letter from Harry C. Butcher, vice president of the Columbia Broadcasting System. The letter from Mr. Butcher was dated June 5, 1940, and said in part:

To repeat what I told you on the phone, I think your statement in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD indicates that you have given a great deal of thought to this subject, as have the executives of the broadcasting networks and stations generally. We appreciate the responsibilities placed upon us by these trying times and are attempting, I believe, with considerable success, to inform the public honestly and conscientiously. Certainly Columbia is making every effort in that direction.

This letter was followed by conferences with representatives of the broadcasting industry and by considerable additional correspondence, with Mr. Kaltenborn and other commentators and officials personally interested in private ownership and operation of radio and its utilization in the best possible public interest. As a result of this correspondence and these conversations, I again addressed the House on June 18, 1940, summarizing my observations and proposing five specific factors to which it seemed to me the radio industry should give serious consideration and develop remedial policies. Mr. Speaker, I incorporate extracts of that speech at this point as a part of these remarks.

RADIO'S RESPONSIBILITIES EXPAND WITH RADIO'S PRIVILEGES

Mr. Speaker, all Members of Congress are aware of the severe charges recently leveled at the American radio industry by certain Government officials charging it with "monopolistic practices" and other unfair policies. Personally, I am unwilling to subscribe to these charges on the basis of available evidence. I think that the record of American radio, taken as a whole, is highly commendable. Great public service is rendered the public by radio through its practice of making available to speakers of opposing sides on controversial issues like periods of free time to present their arguments. To my knowledge radio has not yet been guilty of using its monopoly of favorite air waves and its protective licenses and permits to sponsor one set of protagonists against another or to freeze out opposing viewpoints. It is my sincere hope that radio will never permit itself to become guilty of such prejudicial practices because to my mind that would be a big step backward through providing potent arguments for more Government control or supervision and for substituting bureaucratic control—never very satisfactory and seldom very equitable—for self-restraint and fair-play codes which radio can much better provide for itself by a faithful recognition of the responsibilities which always attach themselves to such special privileges as radio presently enjoys.

With the hope that radio may redouble its efforts to avoid justifiable criticism and that it may reexamine its practices to the end that the best public interests may always be served, I summarize herewith some considerations which I believe radio executives should carefully ponder and not lightly shunt

aside on the basis that at this time no great complaint is evident in demands for legislative reforms or executive restraints. The time to eliminate a widespread public demand for governmental correctives is before the complaint is crystallized—once the crusade is on and a chorus of demands for Government action is apparent, it is frequently too late to stem the tide and all too often the alleged correctives go too far and impose new vices more pernicious than those they would eradicate. No business enterprise is ever so strong or so safe that it can afford to discard substantial segments of its good will by turning a deaf ear to sincere critics and trusting to time alone to quiet valid criticisms. For that reason, I list the following factors for whatever value they may have in stimulating thought leading to the preservation of free radio in America and the nipping in the bud of any proposals that Government action be utilized to eradicate such minor deficiencies as radio may now be heir to. American radio is good and it is getting better. It is entitled to a fair chance to demonstrate that its self-imposed regulations are adequate to serve the public interest and to protect the functions of democratic government in this great Republic.

A SUMMARY OF FACTORS FOR RADIO EXECUTIVES TO CONSIDER

1. Ninety percent of present-day radio programs are free from substantial criticism by the public. That in itself is a high tribute to American radio. The 10 percent of radio programs which cause concern are in the opinionated observations of speakers who are either on the pay roll of the radio companies themselves or who speak for hire for commercial sponsors. Radio cannot afford to ignore the significance as molders of public opinion which these opinionated observers have and the delicate problem growing out of them concerning how far radio or commercial sponsors go in employing speakers for hire to shape public opinion.

2. Radio executives should study the advisability of setting up self-imposed regulations whereby sponsored programs by commercial groups, professional commentators, speakers working for pay and salaried reporters on sustaining programs, should not permit their personal prejudices, their individual opinions, their political philosophies, and their own viewpoints to color the programs in which they participate. To expand this type of opinionated program to its full extent would be to permit the opinion backed by the biggest purse to propagandize America and dominate the air waves. Carried to its ultimate degree, a billion-dollar sponsor could purchase enough time and sponsor speakers and commentators enough to superimpose its philosophy or policies upon an entire people. Thus, such free speech on the air could be used to circumvent the free thinking of a nation.

3. Radio's current policy of permitting conflicting sides of controversial questions to have equal opportunity with free radio time to present its arguments is Americanism in action. It is the essence of democracy and is highly commendable. But if speakers on commercial programs and those speaking on the sustaining programs of the big radio chains themselves attempt to influence public opinion and present lopsided arguments on public questions they can well destroy and nullify the great democratic value of the prevailing policy of giving free time to all sides of a controversial question, because the professional commentators and speakers are on the air so much more frequently than the laymen.

4. Radio should recognize a responsibility for not permitting itself to be for sale to the highest bidder on controversial questions, which is not shared by the newspaper business. The difference is clear-cut and obvious. As many newspapers can present

themselves for public approval in any State or community as the public will support, they seek and secure no governmental license and obtain no governmental monopoly of favored channels of presentation. Thus editors have an independence which radio systems cannot rightfully exercise because radio by its very nature is more monopolistic than are the newspapers. Too many radio stations find too few choice air waves to share for day and night broadcasting. Therefore the Government licenses some and must refuse concessions to others. While no legitimate complaint can attach to this necessity, it does impose upon those radio units favored by Government permit to own an air wave the obligation not to exercise that concession to plump for one opinion or to play down another.

5. Excesses and abuses in the realm of these opinionated programs by speakers for hire are the danger zone around free radio in America. Government regulation could correct the abuses but I hope it will never have to come to that. In my opinion, such coercion is unnecessary. Radio deserves the opportunity to eliminate these abuses for itself where they occur and to guard against their extension. To say they never occur, is to blink at the facts; to say they are the prevailing practice, is to exaggerate the exception. Between the extremes of too many too highly opinionated commercial or sustaining programs, and a ban against all interpretative speakers and personal commentators there is surely a happy compromise at which point such speakers for hire can be selected who will exercise uniform good taste and opinions balanced by open-minded recognition that others equally wise may hold differing viewpoints. Such speakers can be secured, I believe, who will stress the factual over the prejudicial elements of news and who will avoid taking sides on issues of political importance or governmental significance at times and on points which comprise periods of our national history when the general public is seeking to formulate clear-headed and far-reaching decisions which may determine our national destiny for many years to come.

In view of the foregoing experience, Mr. Speaker, I am naturally gratified as are many other Americans, both in and out of Congress, at the progressive and forward-looking step in the interests of free speech and fair play which have been taken by the Columbia Broadcasting System in its recent declaration of policy assuring the listening public that C. B. S. would not permit its facilities to be exploited for propaganda purposes. A few radio commentators have utilized the facilities of other radio networks to condemn C. B. S. for forthrightly barring propaganda from its network. Consequently, Mr. Speaker, I want at this time to read into the record an open letter written by Paul W. Kester, vice president and general manager of C. B. S. at the present time, which presents the C. B. S. point of view in this matter. The letter follows:

FREEDOM OF THE AIR

DEAR MR. WINCHELL: During the past several days you have commented critically on Columbia Broadcasting System's news broadcasting policies. There are at least three points not thus far mentioned in your column, which we think your readers should have in order to understand the real issue involved. In view of your own interest in freedom of expression and journalistic fairness, we urge that you publish this letter explaining why we feel that freedom of expression on the air is protected, not "muzz-

led" by Columbia Broadcasting System's policies of noneditorial news reporting and news analysis.

1. You have not mentioned the fact that, while keeping opinion out of news broadcasting as such, we invite the freest expression of opinion elsewhere in our broadcasting schedule. In other words, our air is wide open to the most partisan speakers on every major issue in the news. Proponents and opponents of lend-lease, post-war collaboration, price control, tax policies, etc., have championed their respective sides of public arguments in a constant battle of public opinion over the Columbia Broadcasting System network. But it is presented as opinion and not as news. This is most important because it eliminates the camouflaged propaganda that opinionated reporters could otherwise insinuate into a field which we think should remain simon pure, honestly objective, and utterly noneditorial.

2. Your comments, we think, imply that Columbia Broadcasting System's policies preclude straight news reporting on "controversial subjects" in the news. The opposite is true. For instance: The draft of fathers is one of the "hottest" controversies now before the public. It has been dealt with fully, freely, and fearlessly on Columbia Broadcasting System network news for the past several weeks. None of our news reporters or news analysts has sought to lobby for or against it. Nor has any one of them avoided accurate news reporting of the controversy's daily progress.

3. You should have told your readers the simple, physical fact that lies behind our policy of nonpartisan news broadcasting. The number of radio wave lengths is, at present, definitely limited. There are only a certain number of physical facilities, that is, of radio transmitters which can be linked into radio networks. Clock hours are also limited. And thus a small group of news commentators, commanding preferred positions and established audiences on nationwide networks, could, if they opinionated their news broadcasting, exert a dangerous and dominating power over public opinion. Such power in the hands of a few, would destroy all fairness on the air—and in a domestic world, there is no freedom without fairness.

PAUL W. KESTER,
Columbia Broadcasting System.

NEW YORK.

THE C. B. S. POLICY STATEMENT

Mr. Speaker, the new policy statement of the Columbia Broadcasting System, to which Mr. Kester's letter refers, dated September 7, 1943, speaks for itself. I am incorporating it with my remarks at this point in the RECORD, since it deserves the study of every American who places the preservation of free speech high among the attributes of this Republic:

To C. B. S. news analysts:

This is a restatement of Columbia's policies in regard to news analysis, an explanation of their reasons for being, and a declaration of our intention to enforce them rigidly to the end that the American listening public will be best served.

Please do not expect anything new in this memorandum. No innovations are involved. It is sent you at this time merely because there have been occasional instances recently in which there seemed to be a lack of clear understanding of our policies both on the part of news analysts and of our editors. I trust this will clear up any confusion which may have existed, especially among newer members of our staff. If not, then I shall be all too happy to discuss these matters with you personally at greater length and

supply you with fresh copies of previous material dealing with our policies.

First off, let it be emphasized that Columbia has no editorial views except in regard to radio itself. By extension, those men selected by us to interpret or analyze the news must also refrain from expression of editorial opinion or our noneditorial position becomes an empty shell.

Each of you has been chosen by us because of your background and knowledge, insight, clarity of thought and special ability to make yourselves understood by vast audiences. We feel we have faced and met a considerable responsibility in your selection. We now feel that you must meet and face much the same responsibility in writing your analyses. For we have said to ourselves, "We will not choose men who will tell the public what they themselves think and what the public should think." And we ask that you say to yourselves, "We are not privileged to crusade, to harangue the people or to attempt to sway public opinion."

In our view, then, the function of the news analyst is to marshal the facts on any specific subject and out of his common or special knowledge to present these facts so as to inform his listeners rather than persuade them. The analyst should attempt to clear up any contradictions within the known record, should fairly present both sides of controversial questions and, in short, should give the best available information upon which listeners can make up their own minds. Ideally, in the case of controversial issues, the audience should be left with no impression as to which side the analyst himself actually favors.

The news analyst, so restricted in the expression of his personal beliefs, may argue that he is being denied freedom of speech, that if he were employed by a newspaper or a magazine, he would have much greater latitude in speaking his mind. This argument brings us to the reasons for the policies I have just enunciated and the best way to deal with those reasons is to declare at once that there is a very considerable difference between the radio station or network and a newspaper or magazine.

The essential contrast is supplied by the available opportunities for publication and for broadcasting. Nothing except lack of funds or unwillingness to risk them prevents anyone anywhere from starting a newspaper, a magazine, or a publishing house. Within the laws of libel, obscenity and sedition, the publisher is then able to say editorially anything he wishes to say, or to hire men to say it for him. But in the case of broadcasting, there are only a certain number of frequencies available for broadcasting stations and by the same token, only a limited number of networks can be created and maintained on a national basis. It is this limitation which makes for the basic difference between broadcasting and the press, from which stems our noneditorial policy. Without such a policy it is easy to see that a powerful and one-sided position on serious issues could be created for a small group of broadcasters locally, regionally, or nationally.

The threat of such unbalanced power is inimical to a democratic and free radio or to democracy itself.

As for those radio-news analysts who cry out that the limitations which our policies impose on them threaten freedom of speech, I think the opposite is true. For we have set aside regular broadcasting periods in which controversial issues of the day can be and are discussed first by one side, then the other. We have declined repeatedly to sell time for the discussion of these issues, so that the greater amount of time (and with it the effective control of public opinion) would not be at the disposal of the side prepared to spend the most money.

Actually freedom of speech on the radio would be menaced if a small group of men,

some thirty or forty news analysts who have Nation-wide audiences and have regular broadcasting periods in which to build loyal listeners, take advantage of their "preferred position" and become pulpsters. To permit these men to preach their own views would be to create for C. B. S. news a super-editorial page, instead of no editorial page at all. Then freedom of the air, within the genuine spirit of democracy, would be merely a hollow phrase. There is no sense to the idea of erecting a barricade that will protect public opinion from one-sided assault and then drilling holes in that defense whereby men in our own employ are permitted just such assault.

Our policies are meaningless unless strictly enforced and every news editor is held accountable for their enforcement. We are quite aware that other networks and individual stations may not as yet have similar policies. We hope that in the interest of furthering a free and democratic radio all of them will come to agree with us. But whether or not they do, we want C. B. S. world news to continue to set the highest possible standards of news objectivity and to retain its leadership in public confidence.

PAUL W. WHITE,

Director of News Broadcasts.

SEPTEMBER 7, 1943.

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. LANDIS. I just want to say that I believe the Members of Congress and others generally are in debt to the Columbia Broadcasting Co. for its readiness in attempting to solve the very serious situation existing in radio news-casting.

Mr. MUNDT. I thank the gentleman for his contribution, and in view of his well-known advocacy of free speech and fair play, it has extra significance. I am sorry, however, that I cannot yield further during these remarks as I have all the material here which I can cover in the time allotted me.

In this connection I would like to read from an article appearing in the October 18, 1943, issue of Broadcasting, the weekly news magazine of radio.

On page 22 of that magazine an article appears, written by Ed. Craney, general manager of Z-Bar Net, the radio network throughout the State of Montana.

Mr. Craney entitled his article "Free Speech, the Right To Be Heard," and I commend the reading of the entire article and editorial to Members of Congress and citizens who are interested in this problem of working out a radio code and a radio policy which will protect the rights and freedom of speech.

I will quote briefly from this article appearing in Broadcasting magazine of October 18: Mr. Craney says:

We of the Z-Net—

Montana's radio network—

recognized the above problems and strove to solve them in the year 1930 with the establishment of the Montana Radio Forum. CBS has just done so. Some say there is no problem—others say some other method must be found. All right—let's find it. I believe all of us are actually striving for the same goal—freedom of speech—the right for both majorities and minorities to be heard on American radio.

Then continuing in his article, Mr. Craney points out there is a definite dis-

tinction between the freedom of expression as it is applied to the newspaper field and how it is applied to radio, because of the differences which are obvious between radio and the newspaper.

He asks this question in his article:

Is radio like a newspaper?

Then he answers:

No—anyone with the funds can start a newspaper. Radio is limited and licensed by Government because of the present lack of frequencies. The good newspaper presents factual news of the day written by "on-the-scene reporters of events all over the world."

It has an editor who is free to express his views on any subject in its editorial columns.

Then he points out the differences existing because of limited facilities on the air, because the radio depends on licensing by the Government to enable a certain station to dominate specified air waves at stipulated times; and he points out further on down that radio broadcasts cannot be laid aside and read later; if the broadcast is not heard it is lost forever.

Still later in the article he calls attention to the fact that there are some who think radio can cure this commentator trouble by a device which has been tried in Montana, the home State of Senator WHEELER who has, himself, devoted a lot of study to the radio situation.

I quote further from the article again:

We of the Z-Net believe commentaries are healthy. We believe the public needs their ideas—we said "theirs," not his or hers. We have saluted C. B. S. on its stand because we know it has taken courage to recognize the problem and C. B. S. is trying to solve this problem. While we do not say our method is the ideal we nevertheless believe it is more practical than any other thus far devised for the protection of the right to be heard and the right to hear.

And I think the Members of Congress who are interested in the welfare of radio are interested in the fact that Mr. Craney recognizes that freedom of speech on the radio means that there must be a right to be heard as well as a freedom of the right to hear and it cannot be exclusively placed within the power of an individual operator on the air.

Continuing the quotation from Mr. Craney's article:

We have merely endeavored to build the columnist page of the newspaper into an air show. We never put a single commentator on the air. We insist on two or more peoples' ideas being expressed on the same or on adjacent shows or we don't carry the broadcast.

I hope the Members of Congress will take time to read this entire article, because it offers an approach to the solution of a very disturbing problem; that is, the alarming tendency of commentators increasingly to use their time and their position to attack individuals in both private and public life and to propagandize and lobby for public causes in which the speakers or sponsors may or may not have a selfish or ulterior motive.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let us leave the problem of making free speech on the air a fact rather than a fiction for the time being and examine the recent Supreme Court decision which bears on the same subject. Later in this talk, I shall return to the original proposition in an

effort to show how the circumvention of free and impartial expression on the air by making it the sole privilege of the sponsors with the biggest purse buying up select time on a semipublic monopoly or of the radio companies themselves has a direct relationship to the implications and ramifications of the Supreme Court decision of May 10.

On May 10, the United States Supreme Court in a decision of 5 to 2 with the majority opinion being written by Justice Frankfurter and the minority opinion being written by Justice Murphy, made it the constitutional law of the land that the Federal Communications Commission should have the right to determine the composition of the traffic on the air. To use the exact words of Mr. Justice Frankfurter with reference to the Federal Communications Act of 1934:

It puts upon the Commission the burden of determining the composition of that traffic.

I think as we go along with this discussion, Mr. Speaker, it will become clear how this decision of the Court has a direct bearing on what should be considered broadcasting policies which are compatible with the best public interests and with considerations of free speech and fair play. It should also become clear how the Court's decision supports my contention that since radio is a semipublic monopoly exercised through preferential licenses granted to some and denied to others, it must either adopt for itself or have imposed upon it from without a public-serving policy which does not permit one group of citizens or one individual to have opinion-molding opportunities which are denied to those of opposing points of view.

RADIO IS NECESSARILY MONOPOLISTIC IN CHARACTER

In Mr. Justice Frankfurter's majority opinion we find some interesting evidence in support of these observations. In support of the statement that radio is monopolistic in character under its existing network system, Mr. Frankfurter makes this statement in a quotation from the Federal Communications Commission:

It pointed out that the station affiliated with the national networks utilized more than 97 percent of the total nighttime broadcasting power of all the stations in the country.

Under these conditions, it is obvious that if the networks are to be used for propaganda or political purposes, or to support or oppose programs of public policy, there must either be provided equal and suitable opportunity for reply or else we must reconcile ourselves to the fact that those who buy up the radio time are to be granted the exclusive right of indoctrination over the air waves in America. I think it will be generally conceded that to make indoctrination the exclusive right of the fellow with the fattest purse or the man with the best spot on the dial is not sound Americanism. And it is not conducive to the permanent operation of private radio in this country. It is, in fact, according to a privilege to a few which will sooner or later draw penalties from the many.

The extent to which this monopolistic character of private radio, when coupled with the use of indoctrination and propaganda over the air, might be used or abused to distort or warp the thinking of America is further elaborated upon by subsequent statements in the prevailing opinion of Justice Frankfurter.

For example, he points out that the Federal Communications Commission found that network affiliation contracts usually contain so-called network optional-time clauses. Under these provisions, the network could upon 28 days' notice call upon its affiliates to carry a commercial program during any of the hours specified in the agreement as network optional time. The Commission reported:

We find that the optioning of time by licensee stations has operated against the public interest.

Certainly, Mr. Speaker, it can be seen how this could be true if networks permit sustaining or commercial commentators to engage in opinion-molding propaganda which could thus be "force fed" over station outlets which, in themselves, are out of sympathy with the propaganda line of the sponsor or the network. For example, many commentators on the air have seemingly joined in a crusade to discredit the farm bloc in Congress and to a certain extent the farmers of America by insinuating that they are demanding better prices for food products than are warranted. Quite apart from the merits of such contentions—and for one I believe they have no merit whatsoever—it is obvious that a radio station in a farm State might seriously object to being forced to broadcast a network program expressing antipathy to the farm element and broadcast by some city commentator who knows nothing about farming conditions and cares less.

It is also brought out in this decision of the court that network affiliation contracts contain a clause defining the right of the station to reject network commercial programs. The F. C. C. is quoted as finding that "these provisions do not sufficiently protect the public interest." The F. C. C. further states:

We conclude that a licensee is not fulfilling his obligations to operate in the public interest, and is not operating in accordance with the express requirements of the Communications Act, if he agrees to accept programs on any basis other than his own reasonable decision that the programs are satisfactory.

Still another indication of the fact that chain broadcasting and network growth has made radio increasingly more monopolistic and consequently more subject to public regulation than ordinary private enterprise is the following statement included in the Frankfurter decision with reference to radio facilities in the major cities and primary news sources of this country. I quote:

Competition among networks for these facilities is nonexistent, as they are completely removed from the network-station market. It gives the network complete control over its policies. This bottling-up of the best facilities has undoubtedly had a discouraging effect upon the creation and growth of new networks.

SPECIAL PRIVILEGES REQUIRE PUBLIC RESPONSIBILITIES

Now, sir, let us get down to a discussion of how the monopolistic development of radio, which in itself has granted special privileges to some, demands the acceptance of special public responsibilities on the part of the radio industry if the present system of radio is to be public serving rather than public perverting.

In the gist of the prevailing decision of the Court, Justice Frankfurter said on May 10:

It puts upon the Commission the burden of determining the composition of that traffic.

In that, Mr. Speaker, he referred to the traffic over the air waves of this country. Continuing to quote from Justice Frankfurter, he further said:

The facilities of radio are not large enough to accommodate all who wish to use them. Methods must be devised for choosing from among the many who apply. And since Congress itself could not do this, it committed the task to the Commission.

Mr. Speaker, this responsibility for devising methods "for choosing from among the many who apply" for radio time as well as for station licenses is the crux of the whole matter insofar as demonstrating whether private radio is to serve the public interest or to serve as a propaganda vehicle for some sponsor, some commentator, some political administration, some network, or some cause.

If it is argued that the method of "choosing from among the many who apply" for time on the air, for example, shall be that of permitting the fellow with the fattest purse to buy advertising time and employ commentators or speakers to denounce or support individuals in public life, institutions of government, organizations of private citizens, or occupational groups, it simply resolves itself into a policy of favoritism to some and frustration for others. In like manner if this process of "choosing" is to be operated so that radio networks can employ commentators on their sustaining time to applaud one point of view and abhor another it means that freedom of speech has become a fiction instead of a fact. It would mean in short that radio networks were reserving to themselves a freedom to indoctrinate which is incompatible with real freedom of speech.

ACCESS TO THE MICROPHONE AN ESSENTIAL IN FREEDOM OF SPEECH

Mr. Speaker, let us keep always in mind the fact that freedom of speech must mean freedom of access to the microphone as well as freedom of acclamation insofar as radio is concerned.

In the concluding summary of the majority opinion as delivered on May 10 by Justice Frankfurter, this analysis of the true meaning of free speech is again emphasized. Says the prevailing opinion:

We come, finally, to an appeal to the first amendment. The regulations—

Of the Commission—
even if valid in all other respects, must fail because they abridge, say the appellants, their right of free speech. If that be so, it would

follow that every person whose application for a license to operate a station is denied by the Commission is thereby denied his constitutional right of free speech. Freedom of utterance is abridged to many who wish to use the limited facilities of radio.

RADIO FACILITIES ARE LIMITED

Mr. Speaker, that statement from the majority opinion should be high-lighted. Let me repeat it:

Freedom of utterance is abridged to many who wish to use the limited facilities of radio.

It is this elemental truth which the new policy of the Columbia Broadcasting System recognizes in its decision to keep all propaganda off its programs unless equal opportunities are given at the same hour and on the same coverage for expression of the other point of view. It is this same fundamental truism which the critics of the new C. B. S. policy ignore and which, when violated, gives cause for public demands restricting the use of radio for private propaganda purposes.

It is, of course, to be expected that a few commentators, Mr. Speaker, or radio officials who enjoy monopolistic privileges of free expression and who have at times used these individualized opportunities to lobby for or against this, that, or the other cause in accordance with their personal views or corporation outlook will disapprove of steps taken along the direction of the C. B. S. policy. Such men may wail that "freedom of speech is being curtailed" but they are not thinking primarily of freedom of speech in the aggregate but of their own personal freedom to use a semipublic monopoly as a personal opportunity to pontificate, propagandize, or pillory. They ignore the axiom that freedom of speech to be realistic when applied to radio must also include freedom of access to the microphone for opposing points of view. Otherwise, any other interpretation of freedom of speech over the air would be a restriction of freedom of thinking rather than an expansion of it. What the thought processes produce depends upon what information is provided as the basis for thinking. If radio is to do its just share toward developing sound and sane national thinking it must either refrain from projecting prejudice and propaganda or else provide for equal representation for all points of view.

RADIO DAILY QUOTES KALTENBORN AGAINST C. B. S.

In the Radio Daily for Thursday, September 16, Mr. Kaltenborn is quoted by this New York City publication which is read widely in radio circles as being severely critical of the C. B. S. policy of barring propaganda from its newscasts. Radio Daily quotes a speech which Kaltenborn made at a luncheon in the Waldorf-Astoria wherein he states in part:

The argument that commentators should have no opinions because only a limited number can be put on the air is false. Newspaper space is also limited. Only a certain number of columnists can get their material printed. Today, we have almost as many commentators with a national following as we have columnists with a national following. The radio news analyst cannot and should

not function night after night as preacher or soap-box orator. He cannot constantly make himself a medium for passionate expression of personal or minority opinions.

Mr. Speaker, these statements by Mr. Kaltenborn warrant some analysis. It appears that there are some blind spots in his thinking. For example, his assumption that an exact analogy can be drawn between newspapers and the radio is inaccurate. While it is true that only a limited number of columnists may get their columns printed, it is equally true that most newspapers present their readers with a balanced diet by carrying columnists with conflicting points of view in the same issue so that the same set of readers get both sides of the question. Such is not the case with radio. It is also true that in a paper's editorial columns it frequently takes exception with something a columnist reports in another section of the same edition. And it is vitally significant that newspapers almost invariably accord to citizens the privileges of answering charges or criticisms by printing open letters in the paper in refutation of something a columnist may have said. This is a feature almost entirely lacking in present radio policy insofar as it applies to prejudicial newscasting, to slurs and criticisms on radio time sponsored by advertisers who sometimes have their own "ax to grind" or to attacks and lobbying propaganda projected by commentators speaking on sustaining programs provided by the networks and in which the nature of the news is colored either by the bias of the corporation officials or by the prejudice of the individual commentator.

The right of rejoinder, Mr. Speaker, is fully as important as the right of criticism insofar as freedom of speech is concerned. It appears that Mr. Kaltenborn overemphasizes a single side of the problem in his criticisms. It is significant, moreover, that even Mr. Kaltenborn notes the excesses to which his profession is heir by continuing:

The radio analyst should not function night after night as a preacher or soap-box orator. He cannot constantly make himself a medium for passionate expression or minority opinions.

That is sound advice. But like the best medicine in the pharmacopoeia, it can affect no cures if never taken.

One wonders, for example, how zealous Mr. Kaltenborn and certain radio officials would be for the "rights of free speech" about which they talk if regulations provided that any individual, group, or cause which is attacked on the radio should have the right to insist upon a like amount of time on an equally important program in which to make reply. I am afraid that those who now enjoy choice radio program periods and carefully selected wave lengths would be the first to protest if public policy insisted that those wont to abuse this privilege must provide those offended with an opportunity on the next regular program to present their side of the story. Advertisers would be less inclined to permit or instruct commentators to engage in crusades of indoctrination if they were compelled to give opposing points of view

an opportunity to be heard "on this same station at this same hour next Sunday evening" or whatever the case might be. It is this inavailability of radio time of like importance to varying points of view which makes one of the big distinctions between a private enterprise like a newspaper and a semipublic monopoly like a great radio network which depends upon the perpetuation of its license to protect it in the use of a highly coveted wave length which it alone can utilize.

Radio officials and men like Mr. Kaltenborn should not expect to be able to enjoy all the privileges of a monopolistic hold on certain wavelengths which is assured them by the Government and at the same time to have all the opportunities for projecting purely personal points of view which would be theirs if they were engaging in a completely competitive enterprise. If government is not to step in to safeguard the public against the propagandist on the air, the radio industry itself must recognize its responsibilities in this matter and not fall back upon the weak alibi that anything which is fair practice for newspapers is also fair practice for the radio.

To conform with the standards of good manners and fair play on the air, it is not necessary to destroy the sparkle and spirit and pungency of radio reporting. It is necessary only to remove the malicious, the prejudicial, the inimical, and the purpose-serving tactics of certain broadcasters and to safeguard the interests of veracity by insisting that radio reporters follow the precepts of good reporting, anywhere, rather than color their reports with personal prejudice and individual bias.

Members of Congress and citizens generally can quickly bring to mind the commentators that they hear and make their own classifications as to whether they measure up to the responsibilities which are theirs as performers on an exclusive stage licensed by the public as a monopoly or whether they pervert their power for personal profit, political advantage, prejudicial acclaim, or just because of habitually bad radio manners. Occasional violations of good taste and good practice can be overlooked, but the repetitious offenders jeopardize the whole future of privately owned radio due to the fact that they abuse their control of a great public-opinion-forming institution which in its very nature is not available to all and which looks to government to protect it against infringements by competitors who frequently might covet a popular wavelength to propagandize a different party line or point of view. It is the hope of those of us in Congress who are working on this problem that the good judgment of enlightened leaders in the industry which has made radio strong will not too long delay taking the steps needed to make privately owned radio as secure as it is strong.

Justice Frankfurter points out, in this prevailing opinion:

Unlike other modes of expression, radio inherently is not available to all. That is its unique characteristic, and that is why, unlike other modes of expression, it is subject to government regulation.

There is no denying the validity of this conclusion.

Radio networks which permit speakers and commentators on either sustaining programs or commercial broadcasts habitually to belabor Congress or the executive departments, or to attack individuals, groups, or points of view are flagrant violators of their public responsibilities as the licensed operators of a semipublic monopoly. Continued flouting of this responsibility, Mr. Speaker, is certain to result in legislative curtailments of private radio or in similar action by the F. C. C. C. B. S. has taken the lead in attempting to avert this result by imposing a voluntary code of fair play and good manners upon itself. It is hoped other networks will do likewise, as I, for one, would deplore seeing private radio replaced by government radio in this country.

RADIO INDUSTRY MUST MEASURE UP TO ITS RESPONSIBILITIES

Mr. Speaker, the radio industry must measure up to its responsibilities as custodians of the public interest on the networks or by its own shortsightedness it will dig its own grave by its own indiscretions.

The serious offenders of good taste and wise policy on the air probably do not number more than five or six. But these five or six can ruin radio for the host of able and conscientious commentators who serve the public interest, and they can cause the stockholders and owners of radio facilities to find their investments becoming worthless and their period of ownership suspended by governmental interference.

ASSOCIATED PRESS DEMONSTRATES BEST REPORTING IS UNBIASED

Mr. Speaker, the phenomenal success of the Associated Press provides the complete rejoinder to those who insist that to be interesting radio reporting has to be biased, prejudicial, or opinionated. The Associated Press serves newspapers of every political preference. It gathers news for papers in every section of the country, and readers in every walk of life look to it for the complete and candid coverage of the news. Surely nobody would argue that the freedom of the press is curtailed because the Associated Press does not permit its great corps of reporters to use this agency of public service as a device for purveying personal spleen or propagandizing and lobbying for public policies. C. B. S. may not have found the final answer to the important business of keeping radio free and fair, but it has faced the problem and is approaching a solution. Perhaps radio might find something worth emulating by studying the reportorial habits of the Associated Press.

CONGRESS WAITS TOO LONG—THEN GOES TOO FAR

It is the history of government in this country that we in Congress wait too long before taking corrective action in matters like this, and when we act we go too far. All this can be avoided if radio management will cooperate now in eliminating the causes for growing discontent before they compel corrective legislation. Simply to ignore the situation is to court disaster.

Before concluding this address I wish to emphasize that it is my conviction that private radio is much to be preferred to government radio in a Republic such as this. Even with its present deviations from proper policy at times I must prefer radio as it is to radio as it would be under government ownership, operation, or domination. However, there is no use of our ignoring the signs of the times.

There are many who prefer a system of radio such as operates in Britain. I do not. As a believer in private radio, however, I am growing steadily more convinced that either through voluntary steps or through legislative channels arrangements must be made to discontinue propaganda activities on the air by speakers utilizing sponsored advertising time or enjoying monopolistic privileges as commentators on network sustaining programs.

It is not the exclusive province of the U-tell-'em Soap Co., the We-fool-'em Lotion Co., or the We-know-all What's It Co. to indoctrinate the American public with the peculiar personal views of the men and women they engage to capture the attention of the audience and to propagandize it between sponsor "plugs" for this or that particular commercial product. Nor is it the inherent monopoly of speakers representing the networks themselves on sustaining time continuously to criticize or commend, to applaud or abhor, to propagandize or to pillory without suitable and adequate opportunities being given for a similar expression of opposing points of view.

Radio provides this equal opportunity for all during political campaigns but it fails to do so in the day-to-day and week-to-week programs which come to us over the air.

THIS PROBLEM MUST BE SOLVED

A number of us in Congress, Mr. Speaker, have made and are making a study of the abuses of radio and proposals for correcting them. We ask the cooperation of all Members on this matter, since it is of vital concern to all. Government has a responsibility in this matter which we do not propose to ignore and which we must not dodge.

It is our hope that the radio industry will take steps to eradicate its own evils, but if Government must act it is felt that Congress can prescribe regulations which will make freedom of speech on the air an equally true privilege of all and not merely an opportunity for propagandizing to the privileged few.

The Columbia Broadcasting System has courageously and patriotically pointed the way for the preservation of private radio and free speech on the air in this Republic. In this effort it deserves the plaudits of all who believe in equal opportunity and fair play. If similar policies prevail or are adopted by the other networks one of the major causes of dissatisfaction with present-day radio will have been corrected. C. B. S. may not yet have found the perfect solution to a vexing problem, but it has made candid recognition of the problem and has taken courageous action to do something about it.

It is the hope of those of us who are devoting ourselves to this subject that

these corrections will be made voluntarily by the great radio networks rather than to force congressional action by a continuation of the abuses which C. B. S. has so wisely set out to correct. America neither wants its radio information distorted by government domination, by party politics, nor by personal pundits with axes to grind and purposes to propagandize. Good judgment and fair play would seem better devices than censorship for preventing the monopolistic facilities of radio from becoming the devices for propaganda for a select few in this great Republic.

American citizens can form their own conclusions when they are given the undiluted and uncolored facts. It is the function of a semipublic monopoly such as radio to relay the facts rather than to fashion the thinking of America.

SUPREME COURT DECISION HAS DANGEROUS IMPLICATIONS

Before concluding, let me say that while I have quoted at length from the majority opinion of the United States Supreme Court in its decision of May 10, I am not at all pleased or satisfied with some of the implications of that decision. I am not happy over the prospect of having the Federal Communications Commission or any other body "regulate the composition of the traffic" over the air waves of America without some definite standards being set up in advance which circumscribe and direct those regulating powers.

A broad application of the "regulation of the composition of the traffic" on the air waves could mean outright government censorship. Its very existence as a right of the Commission operates as a silent threat of censorship to automatically tend to color and bias radio reporting. Now that the Supreme Court has decreed that this right exists, Congress should act promptly to define it clearly, and to limit it definitely so as to bar all possibility of censorship either direct or indirect.

If radio requires a traffic cop of the air America wants him to be bound by specific instructions as to what violations he can and cannot regulate. We must not have a radio traffic cop, whether it be an individual or a commission, with power to exercise personal discretion with regard to what is considered proper traffic on the air waves.

Congress should quickly act to set up safeguards, in the light of the May 10 decision of the Court, to be sure that private excesses of radio are not replaced by governmental censorship of nonmilitary broadcasts.

Regulations can and should be established which are clear to all, which operate equally in the interests of all, which will remove radio from all fear of governmental crack-downs, and which will conform with the principle that in this Government of laws and not of men the only rightful traffic cop of the air must be a code of prescribed behavior compiled in written form and free from any perversions by power-loving men, be they radio commentators, radio-management officials, members of the Federal Communications Commission, or members of the executive or legislative branches of our

Government. Only thus can we realistically enjoy genuine freedom of expression for all alike over the radio networks of this country.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, after the disposition of the legislative business for the day and other special orders, I may address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ELLIOTT). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday, after the disposition of business on the Speaker's table and other special orders, I may address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JONKMAN] is recognized for 20 minutes.

THE FOOD PROGRAM

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, the food situation continues a muddle. For more than a year I have, along with others, been pleading in the well of this House for the appointment of a single food administrator with a competent organization to bring some semblance of order out of chaos. Bills have been introduced to accomplish the same purpose. Through the activities of the Republican Congressional Food Study Committee, H. R. 2739, known as the Jenkins bill, was introduced, but it still lies in the Banking and Currency Committee. Later the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. FULMER], chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, cognizant of the necessity for a single food administrator, reported out a similar bill from his committee, but I understand it reproduces painlessly in the pigeonholes of the Committee on Rules.

All this time the muddling continues. Ten or more agencies or groups of bureaucrats have been handling, or I might say, mishandling, the food problem. Manpower, farm machinery, prices, rationing, and all other elements entering into the problem, instead of being correlated to the respective requirements of our fighting forces, lend-lease, and civilian needs, are still being juggled and jumbled by procrastination, indecisions, conflict of authorities, clash of personalities, and lack of understanding.

And what is the effect of this confusion and maladministration on our farm production and food supply? Let us take the dairy industry for example. In the last few weeks a frantic appeal has gone up from the producers, processors, and distributors of dairy products. We are told, and the facts seem to warrant the prediction, that the country is facing an immediate and Nation-wide shortage of that indispensable food product, milk. Not only has butter gone up to 16 points, but it is unobtainable throughout the country with either points or money or both. And what do those who under-

stand the dairy situation claim is the cause of it? Their first concern is the two threats which have hung over the entire farm production and especially dairy production ever since the beginning of the war, namely shortage of manpower and shortage of farm machinery and equipment. As to the first, except in those channels where there are boys of military age, the manpower situation is acute. Many farmers are not only dependent on their own boys, but on neighbor boys and girls under 14 years of age for their farm help. The Army, Navy, WAC's, WAVES, defense plants, and industrial demands for manpower have drawn heavily on the farm supply. Recently there has been some consideration given farm boys so far as exemption from military service is concerned, but there are still many boys being taken from the farm. Then there is the element of pressure in the way people view boys of military age who are not in the Army that causes many farm boys to voluntarily enlist. The appeal for girls to join the military forces, while all voluntary, is even more effective in rural communities than in cities. Many girls who had otherwise been helpful on farms, especially with such work as assisting with dairying, have now joined the military groups. There is also the appeal from defense and industrial operations that is inducing a large number of available farm workers, both male and female, to leave the farm because of the higher pay in these fields. No farmer can hope to compete with this competition for his labor. Many thousands of auction sales, a record of all times, is a fair indication of farm help entering other activities. Farmers are reported to be working an average of 80 hours a week. They have done a splendid job providing our armed forces, the production line, and the Nation with food. But unless they get more cooperation from the administration through a single administrator, with a voice in the war council, we are inviting a serious threat to our food supply.

As to the second, shortage of farm machinery and equipment, it is no secret that the availability of farm machinery and equipment is almost nil. There are some promises that this situation will improve for the coming year, but so far it is not noticeable insofar as farmers' needs are concerned. All one needs to do is to look at the books and records of any machinery dealer to note that there was practically no machinery available for farmers during the year 1943. I have said there are some assurances of improvement for the year 1944. But with the present disorganized and scattered authority, the chance for improvement is a mere gamble.

W. P. B. reported a shortage of steel in the amount of 6,250,000 tons for last July, August, and September, which necessitated the War Department being cut 14 percent below its requirements. The Navy Department was cut 20 percent, the Maritime Commission 22 percent. The Office of Defense Transportation, which handles all the railroad allotments, was cut 40 percent. For the present quarter, October, November, and December,

W. P. B. estimates that they will be short 4,800,000 tons, and this is probably optimistic. It may amount to more. In spite of these figures, Wilson, of the W. P. B., is alleged to have said on October 8 that there was no shortage of steel.

In the face of all this, farmers are promised that the increase to 40 percent from 20 percent of 1940 allotments for steel made in 1943 for farm machinery in 1944 will be further increased to 80 percent. However, manufacturers and dealers in farm implements and farm equipment are very skeptical of the value of these promises. And well they may be, in view of the already existing shortage of steel for actual war operations. Furthermore, under all the above-named conflict of authorities, what agency will see to it that the approximate one and a half million tons of steel needed for this program will be allotted to the industry, or at least so much of it as can, as a matter of necessity, be spared from actual war production? Much farm machinery has worn out in the past year, so the need will be greater than ever. The dairy industry has real cause for viewing the coming year with genuine apprehension.

Another disquieting condition that has arisen during the past year is dairy prices. Dairying is in an unfavorable position due to the fact that the cost of production, which includes labor and feed, has advanced far more than the price of butter, and as both are main factors in the cost of production of butter, the price of this product must be advanced in order to bring it on the basis where it will be equally remunerative for the farmer to produce this item. Butter, in this period of wartime inflation, is only 1.1 cents per pound higher than it was during the average period of 1921 to 1929. The average Chicago market during that period was 44.9 cents per pound. The market now including the subsidy is 46 cents, and the consumer is buying this product at a base price level of 41 cents, to which, of course, as in all previous times, the cost of packaging and delivery, retail and wholesale handling costs are added. But basically the consumer is buying butter today at 4 cents per pound less than in the period of 1921 to 1929, which certainly was not a prosperous time for agriculture.

Measuring the increase in price levels of all farm products on a basis of that period, you will note that butter is on the bottom of the list from the standpoint of price advance and on the top of the list from the standpoint of increased costs. Therefore, price adjustments must be made or the production of butter, grains, and feeds is out of the picture.

Another element of confusion and destruction is presented by rationing. Butter is now rationed on red stamps and is interchangeable with meats, cheese, cooking fats, lards, oleomargarine, and other substitutes. Even though the people's money is of no value without rationing stamps, the administration should see to it that no red stamps are issued unless upon their presentation with money to the merchant the butter is obtainable. But it is a known fact that in many of our cities removed from the

production areas, you cannot buy butter even though you have stamps authorizing its purchase. Butter has gone up from 8 to 10, from 10 to 12, and now to 16 points, and as above stated this does not mean that with sufficient stamps you can get any butter. It is claimed that this is due to the fact that those living nearest to the supply of butter use all or most of their red stamps for butter in preference to meats, cheese, and so forth, with the result that they have all the butter they want while those farthest from the source of supply cannot get butter even though they have stamps.

It has been suggested that butter stamps be issued for butter only, but this, of course, would require statistical information as to the supply of butter and the number of people there are to use butter. While it is my understanding that this is successfully accomplished in some countries using rationing, it seems to be way beyond the scope or capacity of our present conglomeration of agencies and especially O. P. A., whose business this would be.

This situation with reference to distribution is still more acutely confused and demoralized by other Government agencies, notably those making Government purchases for the Army, Navy, Lend-Lease, and so forth. Recently the American people were apprised of the fact that the Government had in storage about 90 percent of the 235,000,000 pounds of butter in the country. I am informed that this constitutes more than a year's supply for the 8,000,000 men in the armed forces; that the average civilian consumption is only 18 pounds a year, while the above stock would allow each soldier 25 pounds a year. It is my understanding that in view of this situation, the Government procurement agencies have released the current production of butter, and will not purchase any more until April of next year. Now while we want our armed forces to have not only plenty of butter, but a reasonable stock pile to insure the future, such buying for a year in advance is wholly indefensible, especially when this hoarding prevents millions of people all over the United States from securing any butter whatsoever.

This criticism applies to many other food products. It is reported that the Government will shortly release 130,000,000 dozens of eggs, not only because it has overstocked, but also to prevent spoilage. Similar reports have been made of an early release for civilian use of tremendous quantities of dried beans, as well as canned peaches, peas, and ketchup, and perhaps innumerable foodstuffs, the hoarding of which will come to light within the next few weeks.

In other words, the doctrine of scarcity is being advanced by the administration planners on both ends, namely discouraging production and processing on the one hand, and by administration hoarding of the visible supply on the other hand. It seems logical to assert that point system of rationing already shown to have been unnecessary for coffee, said to be unnecessary for sugar, is based not upon scarcity but largely upon

the doctrine of scarcity artificially created by the Washington planners who seek to create an economy in which they will tell the American people when to sow and when to reap. In short, the present administration, which for years has posed as the superplanner of the world, has made a sorry mess of planning our wartime food program so that for the first time in our national life we are, like a shipwrecked crew, reduced to rationing.

The important question in this bureaucratic working at cross purposes is, Does this flow from mere lack of intelligence and efficiency of the President and his fellow travelers? Or is it still the workings of a deliberately planned economy of scarcity of the fellow travelers, which was begun in 1933 by the "brain trust" and is now being carried into successful operation by the "palace guards," Frankfurter, Hopkins, Wallace, Pritchard, Gilbert, Cohen, Rosenman et al.?

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONKMAN. I yield.

Mr. LANDIS. Will the gentleman explain what he means by the use of the term "fellow travelers"?

Mr. JONKMAN. I may say to the distinguished gentleman that I borrowed that from President Roosevelt. The gentleman will remember that the President applied that term a few days ago to five Members of another body. I think it is a very elastic term, it is broad, and takes in a great many things. We must of course bear in mind that things are not always what they are called. I think it is well illustrated by the following incident which is alleged to have occurred in a conversation between Abraham Lincoln and a friend a great many years ago as they were walking along arguing. In the course of the argument President Lincoln pointed to a sheep nearby and said:

There is a sheep with four legs and a tail. If we were to call the tail a leg, how many legs would that sheep have?

His friend said:

Of course, he would have five legs.

Lincoln replied:

Oh, no, merely calling a tail a leg does not make it one.

So my connotation of the term is:

Those who are associated with one upon a course.

It might mean many other things.

As to the first theory, I said in the well of the House over a year ago that—

The President, after 9 months of war and nearly 10 years as Chief Executive of this great Nation, has utterly failed to recognize the fundamental truism acted upon for decades by all competent and successful executives; that the best way to get a difficult job done well and quickly is to assign it, together with power and responsibility, to a single component administrator with an efficient organization, reserving only the right to fire him if he does not deliver.

Since that time I have often heard as well as read in the public press that even his friends and admirers concede that the President is a poor administrator.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. JONKMAN. Gladly.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman overlooks some very important men in the administration, men like Mr. Justice Byrnes, Mr. Vinson, and Mr. Marvin Jones. I do not believe he could pick out better men for the places they occupy than those three men.

Mr. JONKMAN. Does the gentleman know whether they are working under directives of the "palace guard" or not?

Mr. PATMAN. They are all working under directives.

Mr. JONKMAN. I am asking the gentleman what he knows, whether they are working under directives or not.

Mr. PATMAN. I do not know except in our form of government, with which I am familiar to a limited extent, I know that the Executive is in charge of the executive departments.

Mr. JONKMAN. The gentleman is evasive. I am asking the gentleman a direct question: Does he know whether these men are working under directives?

Mr. PATMAN. If the gentleman himself were the Executive everybody who worked for him would work under his direction. That is the way it is with the President.

Mr. JONKMAN. The gentleman is just evading my question. It would be naive and insane to believe that the President is so inefficient and incapable as to let the procrastinations, inefficiencies, conflict of authorities, clash of personalities, and lack of understanding of the various agencies he has created and ostensibly are under his control, proceed from year to year with a definite program of confusion to wreck the Nation's economy. This would be entirely illogical.

Far more logical is the rapidly gaining conviction of Congress and the American people that the President is so controlled and hemmed in by the "palace guard" that he cannot do otherwise. This group, as I have outlined on a previous occasion, has a definite plan to wreck the fundamentals of our 150-year-old economy by throwing it into confusion, chaos, and scarcity and then supplant it with a dictated economy from Washington under their control and ownership. For the last few weeks newspapers, commentators, and political writers have hailed with acclaim a tendency of the President to turn to the right. They cite his appointments of practical men with experience instead of theorists and idealists in key positions and policymaking offices. They frankly state that it is apparently done with an eye to the 1944 election. But no sooner are these appointees settled in their office than it is noticeable that they must either work under directives from the "palace guard" or be relegated to the background or ousted. The "palace guard" is determined to run the country.

That seems to be the picture and Congress at the present time is the only instrumentality to hold the line until the American people can act for themselves.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONKMAN. Gladly.

Mr. MUNDT. I wonder if the gentleman shares with me the alarm that some editors seem to see in the President from the standpoint of turning to the right, it may be just a ruse, that he is following his customary procedure of turning entirely around.

Mr. JONKMAN. That may be the case.

After witnessing the activity and aggressiveness of this Seventy-eighth Congress in 1943, the American people for the first time in over a decade have a renewed confidence in the legislative branch of their Government. We cannot let the people down. It is the responsibility of this Congress to insist that not only the Fulmer bill, but all similar constructive legislation be brought on and passed immediately. This is must legislation and a vital necessity to save our constitutional American liberty and the American way of living from the maw of a bureaucracy which would destroy it for us and our posterity for generations to come.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN] is recognized for 20 minutes.

WASHINGTON—THE NERVE CENTER OF THE NATION

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, times of crisis call for energetic leadership. This Capital City has been through a wartime change which many thought would overwhelm the municipal government, handicapped as it is through lack of real power. It had a great obligation to house and protect wartime Government employees flocking here by the thousands. It had a great obligation to provide essential hospital, school, sewer, water, and other city facilities.

These employees were our boys and girls from your State and my State. We wanted decent accommodations for them and we were vitally interested in the city's progress and in its leadership. We were concerned in the great change that was taking place, not only from the selfish standpoint of a satisfied constituency but from the broader vision of Washington as the Nation's Capital—the nerve center now perhaps of the entire world.

Among other things for which this city is noted is its many periods of investigation, dramatically displayed by the press. Interest is aroused, not only here but throughout the Nation. Washington news is national news. The Home for the Aged, police department, traffic department, the charity hospitals, and other municipal service agencies all get their fair share of congressional investigation. One year this side of the Capitol starts an investigation; the next year another body gets all the publicity.

Interest on Capitol Hill is very easily aroused due to our proximity and to our accessibility. Complaints of all kinds are lodged here, and if consideration were given to all of them there would be no time for anything else except investigational work. We, who have been through these periods so often, suggest due caution before decisions are made.

We suggest further that an effort be made to familiarize yourselves with the municipal government, its intricate procedures and intricate set-up. Before we view the record for the purpose of determining if we have had energetic leadership, let us first ascertain if our Federal-District relationship is confused by misconceptions.

FEDERAL-DISTRICT RELATIONSHIP

My colleagues, walk to the window and look out. As your glance takes in those broad and beautiful avenues, the magnificent park areas, and the magnitude of the building projects within your view, you cannot help but feel that they all eloquently proclaim the fact that this city is not a local community but is a great national city existing for the millions of citizens throughout the Union.

The District government, with more than 15,000 employees, is not a municipal corporation composed of a clerical and official staff born and raised in the District of Columbia. Like Federal departments, its employees almost entirely come from the registers of the Civil Service Commission, and many thousands of them are from the various States in the Union, with reserved home ties and voting privileges. Many of these employees do not even live within the confines of the District of Columbia; they are residents of the nearby States of Maryland and Virginia.

Mr. Speaker, where is there a municipality in the entire world that could, or would, undertake to bring to fruition the mighty schemes of improvements that Congress has authorized for the District. Public, No. 284, Seventy-first Congress, discloses that an appropriation of \$16,000,000 was authorized for the acquisition of land for a great park and playground system, and that that \$16,000,000 was to be reimbursed to the United States by the local taxpayers at the rate of \$1,000,000 a year.

Public, No. 856, Seventieth Congress, entitled "An act to provide for a municipal center in the District of Columbia," authorized the Commissioners to acquire that large site on Pennsylvania Avenue for a municipal center and construct thereon buildings for municipal activities. Thirty or more million dollars will be needed to complete the project. These projects, Mr. Speaker, would not be of this magnitude if this were a little local government.

SOVEREIGNTY RESTS WITH NATION

The sovereign power in the District of Columbia is lodged in the United States, and it possesses full and unlimited jurisdiction both of a political and municipal nature over the District. Its supreme legislative body is Congress. Crimes that are committed in the District of Columbia are not crimes against the District but against the United States.

The Supreme Court of the United States has on numerous occasions referred to the provision in the Constitution which empowered the Congress to exercise exclusive legislation in all cases whatsoever over the seat of the National

Government, and has decided that the Congress has the entire control of the District of Columbia for every purpose of the Government, national or local.

Mr. Speaker, it is important that we remember this fact, and meditate upon our individual responsibility because until some change is made the government of the District of Columbia is simply an agency of the United States for conducting the affairs of its government in this Federal district.

Justice Taft, in the case of *Frether v. Wright* (75 Fed. 742), thereafter Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, said:

It was met that so powerful a sovereignty should have a local habitation the character of which it might absolutely control, and the government of which it should not share with the States in whose territory it exercised but a limited sovereignty, supreme, it is true, in cases where it could be exercised at all, but much restricted in the field of its operation. The object of the grant of exclusive legislation over the District was, therefore, national in the highest sense, and the city organized under the grant became the city, not of a State, not of a district, but of a Nation. In the same article which granted the powers of exclusive legislation over its seat of government are conferred all the other great powers which make the Nation, including the power to borrow money on the credit of the United States. He would be a strict constructionist, indeed, who should deny to Congress the exercise of this latter power in furtherance of that of organizing and maintaining a proper local government at the seat of government. Each is for a national purpose, and the one may be used in aid of the other.

KNOW YOUR CITY

Do you know that the total valuation of all land and improvements in the District of Columbia as of July 1, 1943, is \$2,255,452,295? Of this amount, \$1,354,348,720 is taxable. Property owned by the United States and tax exempt amounts to \$696,526,822; property owned by the District of Columbia and tax exempt, \$90,466,248; and privately owned property tax exempt amounts to \$114,110,505. The total land area of the District of Columbia, exclusive of streets and alleys is 31,060 acres. Of this amount 51.2 percent is taxable; 40.8 percent is owned by the United States; 3.3 percent is owned by the District government; and 4.7 percent is privately owned exempt property.

The Federal Government owns, as indicated, approximately 41 percent of the total land of the District of Columbia, exclusive of streets and alleys. The Federal Government also has title to all the original streets and alleys lying within the boundaries of the original city of Washington, which, generally speaking, is that area lying between Florida Avenue and the Potomac and Anacostia Rivers. In addition to tax exemption, the Federal Government is furnished water without charge, and is not assessed for special improvements, such as curb and gutter, sidewalk, alley paving, sewer and water mains.

Do you know that the enormous growth within the District of Columbia within

the last 3 years has imposed a tremendous burden upon the District government? The population in 1940 was 663,091; the population in 1943, 897,000. In the metropolitan area, the population far exceeds 1,318,000. This burden of increased responsibility is further evidenced by the fact that the total revenue collections in the general fund account during the fiscal year 1943 showed an increase of approximately \$10,000,000 over the amount collected during the fiscal year 1940.

Do you know that the residents of this city paid \$73,576,233 in Federal income taxes in 1942? This amount exceeds the payments of each of 28 States, and also exceeds the combined payment of 8 States.

Do you know that the two civilian Commissioners are appointed by the President of the United States, by and with the advice and consent of the United States Senate?

Do you know that the Engineer-Commissioner is assigned by the President on the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers of the Army?

Do you know that the District government is composed of approximately 70 departments, divisions, and agencies? When you consider this municipal structure with its intricate divisions, you are impressed with the fact that it is a vast business organization with an extremely heavy burden of complicated responsibilities upon the three men selected as its Commissioners.

Do you know that as of this date there are 15,228 employees with an annual pay roll of \$35,934,731? Of these there are 3,412 school teachers; 1,796 policemen; and 920 firemen.

Do you know that the public-school system alone requires an annual appropriation of approximately \$14,000,000? Do you know that in that system 2,323 pupils from the surrounding States of Maryland and Virginia are given free tuition?

Mr. Speaker, I am intensely interested in this city, not only because I am a member of the Appropriations Committee and a member of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the District of Columbia, but because this is my Capital City. The members of our subcommittee have frequently visited and personally inspected many District institutions, and I personally, without any fanfare, without previous announcement or any publicity, have made personal inspections. I have seen things to criticize and, on the other hand, I have seen many things to commend very highly.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that we have a very excellent police department in this city. They are doing a splendid work in their newly organized Police Academy, and I have attended their exercises and observed their operations.

Mr. Speaker, this city has a splendidly organized and most efficient fire department. You would certainly be interested in knowing that the total estimated fire loss during 1943 was \$671,995, a decrease of \$260,038 as compared with the loss for the year 1942. The per capita loss was 79 cents. This figure is

considered to be exceptionally low by fire-control authorities, and is a decrease of 30 cents as compared with the 1942 figure.

You certainly must know how the Commissioners responded to the call for civilian-defense protection. What city has a more efficient or more splendidly organized civilian-defense department?

FINANCIAL OUTLOOK

Mr. Speaker, the District government, like many other municipalities, was very much disturbed at the beginning of hostilities as it considered its financial problems. It was thought that governmental restrictions on the sale of gasoline and appliances of all sorts would materially affect income, and although there has been a serious effect in some items, yet the local municipality's financial outlook is quite satisfactory.

Do you know that the annual revenue availability of the District of Columbia is at this time in excess of \$60,000,000? This gives you some idea of the vast sums expended under the direction of Congress for municipal service here. This is big business, and you must bear in mind that the local executives are vitally concerned with the income as well as the expenditure.

The directing heads of our great governmental agencies have not this twofold responsibility. The Federal Bureau of the Budget and District officials estimate revenue availability. The District Commissioners hear the departments' request for appropriations. The District Commissioners then hear the citizens, and obtain their reaction as to the request made by the departments. The Federal Bureau of the Budget supervises its budget preparation, the President submits it to the Congress, the House Appropriation Committee hears the Commissioners, department heads, and interested citizens. The Senate Appropriations Committee does likewise.

Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, this system has worked well. Certainly we want our institutions inspected, but I am wondering if it is fair to expect men charged with such great responsibility, and whose duties are so arduous, to personally undertake periodic inspections of institutions and organizations under their supervision, and to personally and minutely check every complaint.

The General Accounting Office for many years has been auditing District accounts, yet never in the history of the municipality has there been a major scandal in its government. The Commissioners have a big job, and, in my opinion, their leadership has been energetic.

GALLINGER MUNICIPAL HOSPITAL

I have been interested in the investigation of our local hospital because I, and members of the committee on which I serve, have visited and inspected that institution on many occasions. I had thought that I would be interested in reading the report, but if the editorial of October 14 appearing in the Washington Star is correct in stating that the report ignores the records which show Gallinger as comparing favorably with similar institutions in other cities, that it ignores

the statement made by the Gallinger staff of physicians, and that it ignores the testimony of Dr. William S. Ossenfort, Assistant Surgeon General of the Public Health Service, who made an independent investigation at the request of the chairman of the subcommittee, and who reported favorably on the hospital, then I have no interest in the document.

Gallinger Municipal Hospital is a charity hospital for the indigent and semi-indigent, and it is under the supervision of the health department, an agency which requires a total annual appropriation of approximately \$3,500,000.

If the health department has fallen down on the job, we should give serious consideration to a change in administration, but do you know that in 1917, the local death rate was 16.4 per thousand population, as compared with 10.8 in 1942—the death rate from all causes being the lowest of all time? The deaths from pneumonia alone have shown a reduction from 139 deaths per hundred thousand in 1936, to 60.5 in 1942. Each year has shown a reduction in diphtheria mortality. For a period of 10 years there have been no deaths from smallpox. Typhoid fever is on the wane, and maternal mortality is the lowest of all time. The new low is 2.2 maternal deaths per thousand live births, as compared with 6.5 in 1936. The infant mortality rate struck a new all-time low in 1942.

As a general proposition, figures are just figures, but these figures, Mr. Speaker, are eloquent—they mean something.

Gallinger is a 1,450-bed general hospital. It has facilities and a staff to accommodate practically all types of patients. These facilities include surgery, with modern operating rooms, obstetrics, a new building for diseases of internal medicine, laboratory and X-ray, a pavilion for the treatment of tuberculosis, a contagious disease isolation ward, and buildings for the reception and temporary treatment of mental diseases. It has a pharmacy, and a supporting social service department. It has a department for hydrotherapy and physiotherapy, a large property and supply department, a dietetic service, and a laundry. Its visiting staff is composed of some of the most outstanding medical authorities in the United States.

On January 13, 1943, the following-named physicians were appointed by the Commissioners as members of the visiting staff to serve without compensation during the calendar year 1943:

PROFESSIONAL STAFF OF GALLINGER MUNICIPAL HOSPITAL, 1943

1. DEPARTMENT OF MEDICINE

Dr. Wallace M. Yater, head of department.

(a) Visiting physicians, general medicine

Georgetown division: Dr. Hugh H. Hussey, George Washington division: Dr. Harry F. Dowling, Dr. C. B. Ethridge (electrocardiography), Dr. Bernard L. Hardin, Dr. Walter K. Myers.

(b) Associate physicians, general medicine

Dr. Thomas Kellher, Dr. Bertram Schaefer, Dr. Bernard Walsh, Dr. William C. Lambert, Dr. Stephen Nealon, Dr. Benjamin Manchester (electrocardiography), Dr. A. Fife Heath, Dr. Irving Winik, Dr. Beatrice B. Berle, Dr. Paul

Lichtman, Dr. John B. Marbury, Dr. Frederick D. Chapman.

(c) *Visiting physicians, pediatrics*

Dr. Harry Spigel, Dr. Harold Hobart, Dr. Abe Cohen, Dr. Herman Eisenberg (newborn service), Dr. B. Stein (newborn service), Dr. Margaret M. Nicholson, Dr. Aaron Nimetz, Dr. Caroline Pincock.

(d) *Visiting physicians, tuberculosis*

Dr. Malcolm Lent.

(e) *Visiting physicians, contagious diseases*

Dr. Richard Meredith, Dr. Carl C. Dauer, Dr. H. H. Diamond, Dr. Mabel H. Grosvenor.

(f) *Visiting physicians, dermatology and syphilology*

Dr. Walter Teichman, Dr. Alvin E. Wode, Dr. Russell J. Fields, Dr. Leon H. Warren.

2. DEPARTMENT OF SURGERY

Dr. Charles Stanley White, head of department.

(a) *Visiting surgeons—general surgery*

Dr. F. Fishback, Dr. Philip Caulfield, Dr. Leo Gaffney, Dr. Edgar W. Davis (thoracic surgery), Dr. Lloyd Collins, Dr. H. E. Cole, Dr. B. F. Dean, Dr. Alec Horwitz, Dr. W. R. Morris (thoracic surgery).

(b) *Associate surgeons, general surgery*

Dr. V. Hungerford, Dr. H. E. Newman, Dr. Michael DeVito (plastic surgery), Dr. J. J. Weinstein, Dr. D. C. Richtmeyer.

(c) *Visiting surgeons, orthopedics*

Dr. J. S. Neviaser.

(c) *Visiting surgeon, orthopedics*

Dr. E. J. Cummings, Dr. Thomas Egan, Dr. Walter Romejke, Dr. Ernest Sheppard, Dr. Leonard Goodman, Dr. Ronald Cox, Dr. Sterling Bockoven, Dr. C. R. Naples.

(e) *Visiting surgeons, otolaryngology*

Dr. J. Louzon, Dr. John H. Gilligan, Dr. John H. Trinder, Dr. E. M. O'Brien, Dr. Catherine Birch, Dr. James Lyons, Dr. P. S. Constantinople, Dr. Joel N. Novick, Dr. H. King Vann, Dr. Gordon J. Bell, Dr. L. B. Tibbetts, Dr. David Davis.

(f) *Visiting surgeons, urology*

Dr. W. P. Herbst (chief), Dr. Hilbert Sabin, Dr. J. S. Rosenthal, Dr. J. F. Rogers, Dr. Thomas C. Thompson (chief), Dr. Gilbert Ottenberg.

(g) *Visiting dentists*

Dr. J. Keaveny, Dr. C. N. Rodlun, Dr. Victor Skinner.

3. DEPARTMENT OF OBSTETRICS AND GYNECOLOGY

Dr. Radford Brown, head of department.

(a) *Visiting obstetricians*

Dr. J. B. Jacobs, Dr. Keith Cromer, Dr. George J. Ellis, Dr. Allan King, Dr. W. R. Thomas, Dr. Joseph Harris, Dr. George Nordlinger.

(b) *Associate obstetricians*

Dr. J. L. Conley, Dr. David Kushner, Dr. J. Francis Warren, Dr. Howard P. Parker, Dr. J. A. Dusbabek, Dr. W. Dandridge Terrell, Dr. B. Richwine.

(c) *Visiting gynecologists*

Dr. William J. Cusack, Dr. Roy Higgins, Dr. L. L. Cockerille, Dr. Roger O'Donnell, Dr. Bernard Notes, Dr. Radford Brown.

(d) *Associate gynecologists*

Dr. James Waters, Dr. Clarence K. Fraser, Dr. S. Hazen Shea, Dr. Julius Epstein, Dr. Floyd S. Rogers.

4. DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHIATRY

(a) *Visiting physicians, psychiatry*

Dr. R. W. Hall, Dr. H. E. Twombly.

(b) *Visiting physicians, neurology*

Dr. Antoine Schneider, Dr. J. J. Shugrue, Dr. Walter Freeman, Dr. Robert H. Groh

(neuro-surgery), Dr. James W. Watts (neuro-surgery).

5. DEPARTMENT OF LABORATORIES AND RADIOLOGY

Dr. Eugene R. Whitmore, head of department.

(a) *Visiting pathologists*

Dr. W. N. Ransone, Dr. Richard Fucher, Dr. Olive Pippy, Dr. Roger M. Choicser, Dr. Thomas M. Peery, Dr. Richard Kelso, Dr. Irving Marks, Dr. Corrine Cooper.

(b) *Visiting roentgenologist*

Dr. Fred O. Coe.

6. SPECIAL CONSULTANTS

Dr. William G. Morgan, gastroenterology; Dr. William McC. Ballinger, gastroenterology; Dr. Joseph S. Wall, pediatrics; Dr. F. C. Schreiber, otolaryngology; Dr. Thomas S. Lee, cardiology; Dr. J. W. Peabody, tuberculosis; Dr. D. L. Finucane, tuberculosis; Dr. J. J. Mundell, obstetrics; Dr. Edmund Horgan, surgery; Dr. G. W. Ault, proctology; Dr. E. C. Rice, contagious diseases; Dr. L. A. Martell, gynecology; Dr. H. F. Anderson, dermatology and syphilis; Dr. W. A. Bloedorn, medicine; Dr. William T. Davis, ophthalmology; Dr. D. B. Moffet, otolaryngology; Dr. H. H. Donnelly, pediatrics; Dr. Winfred Overholster, psychiatry; Dr. F. A. Reuter, urology.

Mr. Speaker, it is impossible to estimate the value of the service of this professional visiting staff. They are rendering a noble service, and are the ones who could really tell you about the conditions at Gallinger.

The development of what is now known as Gallinger Municipal Hospital began in the year 1920. Prior to that date, what there was of the institution was known as the Washington Asylum and Jail, which consisted largely of the jail, the almshouse, and a smallpox isolation building, all old buildings, and some of which were erected during and right after the Civil War.

Since 1920, Congress has appropriated for capital improvements \$2,855,952. In addition, the District has received for capital improvements at the Gallinger Municipal Hospital, \$2,562,161.22 P. W. A. money. The total capital investment at Gallinger Hospital is \$6,213,311.64. The sums received from P. W. A., the original investment in the old Civil War buildings, \$91,198.42, and \$704,000 received since 1942 through Federal Works Administration grants make up this sum.

Until 1938, the hospital was under the Board of Charities, which in 1926 became the Board of Public Welfare. It was transferred to the Health Department in accordance with the Appropriation Act of 1938. Since that time, the health officer has had direct supervision, and an assistant health officer was appointed by the Commissioners to assist in this supervision.

The annual maintenance costs of this charity hospital approximates today \$1,600,000. Five years ago the annual maintenance costs approximated \$800,360.

The number of patients at Gallinger Municipal Hospital during 1942 are summarized as follows:

Total admissions.....	15,828
Total births.....	2,264
Total deaths.....	1,402
Total discharges.....	16,727
Daily average patients in hospital.....	1,051.8
Total number of patient days.....	383,903

In no month of the year did the average occupancy exceed 1,200 patients, and its bed capacity is 1,450.

Adverting to the figure on total births at Gallinger, which represents 11 percent of all the births in the District of Columbia during 1942, I wish to point out to the Members of the House that of the total of 2,264 only 2 births resulted fatally. In my opinion this record is one to be proud of.

The number of positions is 901 to 930, but you gentlemen must remember that the manpower problem is serious, and is becoming increasingly so, and I am informed that as of this day there are in excess of 170 unfilled positions at Gallinger, and many hundreds throughout the municipal service. Then again, the war demands have brought about such a terrific turn-over that our departments and institutions are becoming honey-combed with individuals who are not up to the standard in qualifications, who are inexperienced and frequently inefficient and unambitious. It is not a question of funds, for ample funds have been made available. It is the question of the war impact on personnel. Certainly the Capital building program has been materially interfered with, but on November 1, 1942, ground was broken for an obstetrical pavilion to house 150 mothers with adequate facilities for their entrance, including nurses.

Funds for these improvements were provided for by the Lanham Act. This Congress approved and authorized the renovation of the buildings located on Upshur Street as a convalescent home to help relieve the burden of Gallinger, as well as Glenn Dale hospitals. We have been aware of our responsibilities, and so have the District officials.

In the 1942 appropriation act Congress, upon recommendation of the Appropriations Committee, authorized the expenditure of \$78,750 for a new kitchen at Gallinger Municipal Hospital, which kitchen would have provided for the feeding of 1,500 patients 3 times a day, whereas the existing facilities were built to feed approximately 300 patients 3 times a day. Following the appropriation a request was made by the Commissioners to the War Production Board, and this within 30 days, for preference ratings so that critical materials might be obtained to carry out promptly this much needed facility. On July 28, 1942, the War Production Board issued a preference rating for materials in the amount of \$4,400.95, an amount sufficient to repair obsolete and dilapidated ice boxes. It refused preference ratings for the construction of the kitchen. On September 2, 1942, a further request was made to the War Production Board to allow ratings for this project. Again it was refused, but they did allow \$4,300 for the repair of kitchen equipment.

Gentlemen, Gallinger today, with a load of 1,051 patients and a capacity of 1,451 patients, is compelled to use a kitchen built and equipped to feed 300 patients 3 times per day, and in addition to that other meals made necessary by special diets, formulas, and the staff.

That the hospital has managed to feed 1,051 patients in a kitchen, the capacity of which is around 300, is a remarkable tribute to the administrative skill of those in charge.

The full force of the war's impact on this situation was felt when food rationing, the inability to obtain certain food products, and the manpower shortage combined to accentuate the problem that had long existed.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. FULBRIGHT, for 1 day, on account of official business.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1347. An act to amend section 12 of the Naval Aviation Cadet Act of 1942; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 1351. An act to amend the act of May 27, 1908, as amended, authorizing settlement of accounts of deceased officers and enlisted men of the Navy and Marine Corps; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 1352. An act to provide for reimbursement of officers, enlisted men, and others in the naval service of the United States for property lost, damaged, or destroyed in such service; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 533. An act for the relief of John P. von Rosenberg; and

H. R. 3029. An act to authorize the adoption of a report relating to seepage and drainage damages on the Illinois River, Ill.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 28 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, October 19, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON RIVERS AND HARBORS

The Committee on Rivers and Harbors will meet Tuesday, October 19, 1943, at 11 a. m., to hold hearings on the following projects: Connecticut River, between Hartford, Conn., and Holyoke, Mass.; Alabama-Coosa Rivers, Ala. and Ga.; Tennessee-Tombigbee waterway; and Trinity River, Tex.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Subcommittee No. 1 of the Committee on the Judiciary will conduct hearings on House Joint Resolution 39, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, extending the right to vote to citizens 18 years of age or older, at 10 a. m. on Wednesday, October 20, 1943, in room 346 old House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

Subcommittee No. 2 of the Committee on the Judiciary will conduct hearings

on H. R. 786, a bill to amend section 40 of the United States Employees' Compensation Act, as amended (to include chiropractic practitioners), at 10:30 a. m. on Wednesday, November 3, 1943, in room 346 old House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the petroleum subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, at 10 a. m., Thursday, October 21, 1943.

Business to be considered: To begin hearings on the petroleum situation.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The hearing which was scheduled for Tuesday, October 19, 1943, at 10 a. m., on the bill, H. R. 3334, relating to certain benefits to trainees in the Maritime Service, has been postponed until Tuesday, October 26, 1943, at 10 a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

855. A letter from the Director, Selective Service System, transmitting substitution for page No. 1 of the Consolidated Report of Personnel Requirements for the Quarter Ending December 31, 1943; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

856. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to section 16 of the Organic Act of the Virgin Islands of the United States, approved June 22, 1936, one copy of various legislation passed by the Municipal Council of St. Croix; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

857. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to section 16 of the Organic Act of the Virgin Islands of the United States, approved June 22, 1936, one copy of the following legislation passed by the Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John: Bill No. 53, budget for the municipality of St. Thomas and St. John for the fiscal year July 1, 1943, to June 30, 1944; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

858. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to provide for reimbursement of certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of fires in tents used as quarters by members of the Twelfth Naval Construction Battalion, Long Island, Alaska, on December 26, 1942, and May 26, 1943, respectively; to the Committee on Claims.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. LANHAM: Committee on Patents. H. R. 3130. A bill to prohibit proof of acts done by an inventor in foreign countries; without amendment (Rept. No. 778). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. WARD: Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads. S. 970. An act authorizing the Postmaster General to use post-office clerks and city letter carriers interchangeably; with amendment (Rept. No. 779). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BECKWORTH:

H. R. 3471. A bill making it a misdemeanor to stow away on aircraft and providing punishment therefor; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CURTIS:

H. R. 3472. A bill to permit the amount of charitable contributions made or to be made to be taken into account in computing the tax required to be deducted and withheld on wages; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GEARHART:

H. R. 3473. A bill to permit the amount of charitable contributions made or to be made to be taken into account in computing the tax required to be deducted and withheld on wages; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BUFFETT:

H. R. 3474. A bill to abolish certain fees to be taxed and allowed to attorneys, solicitors, and proctors in the courts of the United States and to district attorneys; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEARNEY:

H. R. 3475. A bill to provide monthly payments for unemployed veterans of the present war for a limited period after separation from the service; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WHITE:

H. R. 3476. A bill to approve a contract negotiated with the Klamath drainage district and to authorize its execution, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

By Mr. STEAGALL:

H. R. 3477. A bill to continue the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, to revise the basis of annual appraisal of its assets, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WARD JOHNSON:

H. R. 3485. A bill to maintain on active duty during the present war officers of the Regular Army who reach retirement age; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PACE:

H. R. 3486 (by request). A bill to amend the Current Tax Payment Act of 1943; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REES of Kansas:

H. R. 3487. A bill to reduce immigration quotas as determined and proclaimed under the Immigration Act of 1924; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. PITTINGER:

H. J. Res. 173. Joint resolution establishing joint congressional committees to obtain complete information with respect to the functioning of the executive departments and independent agencies of the Government; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BYRNE:

H. R. 3478. A bill for the relief of the estate of Edward P. McCormack, former postmaster at Albany, N. Y.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HINSHAW:

H. R. 3479. A bill for the relief of Daniel N. Skeeters; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JENSEN:

H. R. 3480. A bill granting an increase of pension to Jennie L. Empson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LAMBERTSON:

H. R. 3481. A bill for the relief of J. William Ingram; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 3482. A bill for the relief of James F. MacKinnon; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LANHAM:

H. R. 3483. A bill relative to the military record of Charles C. Rascoe, deceased; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan:

H. R. 3484. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Pearl W. Peterson; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2987. By Mr. ANDREWS: Letter from the Business and Professional Women's Club of the Tonawandas, New York, expressing their approval, by resolution, of equal rights amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2988. Also, resolution adopted by the Niagara Frontier Cooperative Milk Producers Bargaining Agency, Inc., of Buffalo, N. Y., protesting against any further subsidy for the dairy industry; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2989. Also, resolution adopted by the Buffalo Association of Fire Underwriters, favoring the enactment of House bill 3269 and Senate bill 1362; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2990. By Mr. SMITH of West Virginia: Eight petitions of the adult classes of the Calvary Baptist Church Sunday School, Charleston, W. Va., urging the enactment of House bill 2082, the Bryson bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2991. By Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON: Petition of Frances M. Cushman and Edward M. Polk, of Corsicana; Lottie May Walker and W. A. McMillan, of Bremond and Calvert, respectively; and Jno. A. Moore, of Bryan, all of the State of Texas, favoring House bill 3269 and House bill 3270; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2992. Also, memorial of Lois J. Martin, of Hillsboro, and Fred H. Clark, of Ennis, Tex., favoring House bill 3269 and House bill 3270; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2993. By Mr. TROUTMAN: Petition of 63 members of the Kiwanis Club, of Williamsport, Pa., protesting against the passage of House bill 2861 and Senate bill 1161, to amend and extend the provisions of the Social Security Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2994. By Mr. HESS: Petition of Gustav Pfeiffer, Thorpe R. Green, and other citizens of Hamilton County, Ohio, protesting against any legislation which would establish national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2995. By Mr. PLOESER: Petition of G. H. Keigel and 19 petitioners of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2996. Also, petition of E. J. O'Connor and 19 petitioners of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2997. Also, petition of Edna Messenger and 20 petitioners of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2998. Also, petition of Sebastian Kretschmann and 180 petitioners of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2999. Also, petition of Al Offerman and 19 petitioners of St. Louis, Mo., protesting

against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3000. Also, petition of Frank Schaub and 19 petitioners of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3001. Also, petition of Harry Salabay, Jr., and 39 petitioners of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3002. Also, petition of Joseph J. Montrey and 80 petitioners of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3003. Also, petition of Frank Zorevry and 20 petitioners of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3004. Also, petition of Bert Schader and 19 petitioners of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3005. By Mr. MICHENER: Petition of Gertrude F. McCulloch, of Jackson, Mich., and signed by 110 other residents of the community, urging repeal of the Chinese Exclusion Act; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

3006. By Mr. MCGREGOR: Petition of the members of the Christian Church of Mount Vernon, Knox County, Ohio, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3007. By Mr. GRIFFITHS: Petition of sundry citizens of Trinway, Ohio, supporting House bill 2082, prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3008. By Mr. MURDOCK: Petition of Fred R. Daehler and 26 other citizens of Globe, Ariz., urging the enactment of House bill 2082, which would stop the manufacture and sale of alcoholic beverages for the duration of the war and during demobilization and remove one of the chief causes of absenteeism, conserve shipping space, and prevent the waste of untold amounts of money and huge quantities of food, coal, iron, rubber, and gasoline; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3009. By Mr. COCHRAN: Petition of George Valtos, of Washington, D. C., and 49 other Washington, D. C., citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3010. Also, petition of Mrs. A. Schmutzer, of Washington, D. C., and 20 other citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3011. Also, petition of Albert Schmutzer, of Washington, D. C., and 20 other citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3012. Also, petition of John Bowers, of Washington, D. C., and 40 other citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3013. Also, petition of Leo Santos, of Washington, D. C., and 20 other citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3014. Also, petition of Mrs. Caylor and 23 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against

the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3015. Also, petition of Joe Cassulo and 22 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3016. Also, petition of Tom Bellino and 23 other citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3017. Also, petition of E. Hahn and 23 other citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3018. Also, petition of Adam Kohl and 20 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3019. Also, petition of Edward Wedel, of St. Louis, Mo., and 19 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3020. Also, petition of Sebastian Kretschmann and 19 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the enactment of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3021. Also, petition of Mrs. I. Speiss and 20 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3022. Also, petition of George Doloon and 20 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3023. Also, petition of Joe A. Busch and 20 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3024. By Mr. WHEAT: Petition of sundry citizens of Lakewood, Ill., asking for the passage of a law protecting the service boys against alcoholic liquor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3025. Also, petition of sundry citizens of Decatur, Ill., asking for the passage of a law protecting the service boys against alcoholic liquors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3026. Also, petition of sundry citizens of Pana, Oconee, and Decatur, Ill., asking for the passage of a law protecting the service boys against alcoholic liquors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3027. Also, petition of sundry citizens of Moweaqua, Ill., asking for the passage of a law protecting the service boys against alcoholic liquors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3028. Also, petition of the Douglas County Woman's Christian Temperance Union, asking for the passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3029. Also, petition of sundry citizens of Macon and Decatur, Ill., asking for the passage of a law protecting the service boys against alcoholic liquors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3030. Also, petition of sundry citizens of Tower Hill and Shelbyville, Ill., asking for the passage of a law protecting the service boys against alcoholic liquors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3031. Also, petition of sundry citizens of Decatur, Ill., asking for the passage of a law protecting the service boys against alcoholic liquors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3032. Also, petition of sundry citizens of Tower Hill, Ill., asking for the passage of a

law protecting the service boys against alcoholic liquors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3033. Also, petition of sundry citizens of Findlay, Shelbyville, Moweaqua, and Decatur, Ill., asking for the passage of a law protecting the service boys against alcoholic liquors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3034. Also, petition of sundry citizens of Stewardson, Mode, and Shelbyville, Ill., asking for the passage of a law protecting the service boys against alcoholic liquors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3035. Also, petition of sundry citizens of Shelbyville and Pana, Ill., asking for the passage of a law protecting the service boys against alcoholic liquors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3036. Also, petition of sundry citizens of Tuscola, Ill., asking for the passage of a law protecting the service boys against alcoholic liquors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3037. Also, petition of sundry citizens of Mattoon, Ill., asking for the passage of a law protecting the service boys against alcoholic liquors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3038. Also, petition of sundry citizens of Niantic, Ill., asking for the passage of a law protecting the service boys against alcoholic liquors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3039. Also, petition of sundry citizens of Decatur, Ill., asking for the passage of a law protecting the service boys against alcoholic liquors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3040. Also, petition of sundry citizens of Cowden, Herrick, and Shelbyville, Ill., asking for the passage of a law protecting the service boys against alcoholic liquors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3041. Also, petition of sundry citizens of Tower Hill, Ill., asking for the passage of a law protecting the service boys against alcoholic liquors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3042. Also, petition of sundry citizens of Tower Hill, Ill., asking for the passage of a law protecting the service boys against alcoholic liquors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3043. Also, petition of sundry citizens of Tower Hill and Shelbyville, Ill., asking for the passage of a law protecting the service boys against alcoholic liquors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3044. By Mr. ROLPH: Resolution No. 3601 of the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco, memorializing the Congress of the United States to sponsor Federal legislation to permit of reduction in income taxes by an amount not to exceed \$7,500 for construction or reconstruction of buildings; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3045. By Mr. TALLE: Petition of Stauffer and Cummings, of Vinton, and sundry other citizens of Benton County, Iowa, protesting against prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3046. By Mr. WARD JOHNSON: Petitions signed by 42 residents of Long Beach, Calif., urging the passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082), to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3047. Also, petition signed by 40 members of the California Heights Methodist Community Church of Long Beach, Calif., of which Rev. Rolland M. Tinscher, Jr., is the pastor, urging the passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082), which would prohibit the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquor in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3048. Also, letter from Rev. D. W. Simpson, pastor of the North Long Beach Church of the Nazarene, of North Long Beach, Calif., and 2 petitions signed by 40 members of his congregation, urging the passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082), which would prohibit the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquor in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3049. Also, petitions received from Rev. Arthur A. LeMaster, pastor of the Calvary Baptist Church, of Long Beach, Calif., signed by him and 64 members of his congregation, urging the passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082), which would prohibit the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquor in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3050. By Mr. LYNCH: Petition of Gouverneur Morris Post, No. 1209, American Legion, Bronx County, N. Y., urging the designation of St. Ann's Church of Morrisania, N. Y., as a national site; to the Committee on the Library.

3051. By Mrs. SMITH of Maine: Petition of Melvin O. Bradford and others, of Anson, Maine, favoring consideration of House bill 2082 to restrict the liquor sales; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3052. Also, petition of Wesley Rickards, of Madison, Maine, and other citizens of the vicinity, favoring consideration of House bill 2082, to bring about a suspension of the alcoholic beverage industry for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3053. Also, petition of M. O. Bradford, of Anson, Maine, and other citizens of the vicinity, favoring consideration of House bill 2082, to bring about a suspension of the alcoholic beverage industry for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3054. Also, petition of Mamie E. Benner, of Waldoboro, Maine, and others, urging the passage of House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for winning the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3055. Also, petition of George B. Ritchie, of Pittsfield, Maine, and others, favoring the adoption of the Townsend plan as embodied in House bill 1649, and to make it an amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3056. By Mr. REED of Illinois: Petition of Fritz Bierstube, of Aurora, Ill., and 21 citizens, protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3057. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the board of directors of the Chamber of Commerce at Coeur D'Alene, Idaho, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to recommendation to take whatever means necessary to prevent the continuation of unnecessary Government bureaus after the war is won; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

SENATE

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 19, 1943

(Legislative day of Tuesday, October 12, 1943)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

The Reverend Hunter M. Lewis, B. D., assistant minister, Church of the Epiph-

any, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

O God, Almighty and Eternal, who holdest in Thine hand the destiny of men and nations and from whom cometh every good and perfect gift: We beseech Thee to bestow upon all to whom Thou hast committed the Government of this Nation the gift of Thy Holy Spirit, the spirit of wisdom and understanding, of counsel and strength, that in all their deliberations and decisions they may be guided of Thee. And to the people of this land grant the spirit of generous and courageous sacrifice, that in their response to the challenge of this day, they may labor for the work's sake without undue thought of gain, unspoiled by increase of income, seeking to give the best that is within them.

We beseech Thee also, O Lord, to behold and bless all who have gone forth in the defense of our country. Sanctify both them and the cause we have espoused, that they and all who are met together in the cause of freedom may go forward in the power of conscious integrity. We dare not pray for our victory, but we pray that Thou wilt guide us unto Thine own victory of righteousness, justice, and peace. Grant this, O Father, for the sake of Him who died to make men free, Thy Son, our Saviour, Jesus Christ. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The Secretary, Edwin A. Halsey, read the following letter:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D. C., October 19, 1943.
To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. HATTIE W. CARAWAY, a Senator from the State of Arkansas, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

CARTER GLASS,
President pro tempore.

Mrs. CARAWAY thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. GERRY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Monday, October 18, 1943, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. GERRY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Caraway	Green
Andrews	Chandler	Guffey
Bailey	Chavez	Gurney
Ball	Clark, Idaho	Hatch
Bankhead	Clark, Mo.	Hawkes
Barbour	Connally	Hayden
Barkley	Danaher	Hill
Bilbo	Davis	Holman
Brewster	Downey	Johnson, Calif.
Bridges	Eastland	Johnson, Colo.
Buck	Ellender	Kilgore
Burton	Ferguson	Langer
Butler	George	McCarran
Byrd	Gerry	McClellan
Capper	Gillette	McFarland